DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 829 UD 026 023

AUTHOR Bade, Maryjean
TITLE Chapter 2 Evaluation Report for 1984-85 & 1985-86.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.
PUB DATE Jul 87
NOTE 104p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Program Costs; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Proposals; School Support
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2; Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

ABSTRACT

The Chapter 2 (Educational Block Grant) program of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA), which became effective on July 1, 1982, aims to improve elementary and secondary education (including pre-school education) for children attending both public and private schools. Two major goals are the following: (1) to provide flexibility for the use of monies in accordance with specific educational needs; and (2) to greatly reduce the administrative and paperwork burden imposed upon the schools. This report, presented in two parts, evaluates the use of Chapter 2 funds in Wisconsin during the academic years 1984-85 and 1985-86, respectively. Each part contains the following sections: (1) State Level Funds; (2) Five Percent State Level Discretionary Projects; (3) State Advisory Committee Report; and (4) Chapter 2 LEA (Local Educational Agencies) Evaluation Survey Results. Data covering allotments per student and program costs are presented on 13 tables. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EVALUATION REPORT

FOR 1984-85 & 1985-86

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Harmatuck
Wisconsin State Dept. of Pub. Instru.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION / HERBERT J. GROVER, STATE SUPERINTENDENT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION

WISCONSIN ANNUAL REPORTS
1984-1985
AND
1985-1986

EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT
THE EDUCATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

Prepared by:

Maryjean Bade, Supervisor, Block Grants, Chapter 2 - ECIA
Bureau for School Management Services and Federal Aids

With Contributions From
Bettejane Achtor, Budget Analyst
Bureau for Policy and Budget

In Cooperation With
Amza Vail, Director
Bureau for School Management Services and Federal Aids

Steven B. Dold, Director
Bureau for Policy and Budget

C. Richard Nelson, Assistant State Superintendent
Division for School Financial Resources and Management Services

and
Gary K. Johnson, Assistant State Superintendent
Division for Management and Budget

July 1987

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent

Bulletin No. 8038

The Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, age, religion, handicap, or national origin.

WISCONSIN CHAPTER 2 EVALUATION REPORT

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction and Overview of Chapter 2 Program.	1
PART ONE: Evaluation 1984-1985	6
1984-85 State Level Funds.	9
Five Percent State Level Discretionary Projects.	13
1984-85 State Advisory Committee Report.	25
1984-85 Chapter 2 LEA Evaluation Survey Results.	39
PART TWO: Evaluation 1985-1986	51
1985-86 State Level Funds.	54
Five Percent State Level Discretionary Projects.	59
1985-86 State Advisory Committee Report.	79
1985-86 Chapter 2 LEA Evaluation Survey Results.	93

List of Tables:

Table 1	Chapter 2 Funding 1984-85.	7
Table 2	Complete Annual School Costs 1984-85	8
Table 3	Chapter 2 Funded SEA Positions 1984-85	10
Table 4	1984-85 Chapter 2 Direct Administration.	11
Table 5	1984-85 State Level Discretionary Projects . . .	12
Table 6	1984-85 Student Participants and Expenditures As Reported on LEA Applications.	47
Table 7	Chapter 2 Funding 1985-86.	52
Table 8	Complete Annual School Costs 1985-86	53
Table 9	Chapter 2 Funded SEA Positions 1985-86	55
Table 10	1985-86 Chapter 2 Direct Administration.	56
Table 11	Evaluation of Services Provided With State Level 15% Funds 1985-86.	57
Table 12	1985-86 State Level Discretionary Projects . . .	58
Table 13	1985-86 Student Participants and Expenditures As Reported on LEA Applications.	97

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM

History of Chapter 2 ECIA Programs

The Chapter 2 (Educational Block Grant) program of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) became effective on July 1, 1982. Approximately 28 categorical education programs were consolidated by Congress under one bill, Public Law 97-35, to allocate funds to state and territorial education agencies. The 28 antecedent programs included direct federal discretionary funds to local education agencies and programs administered by state educational agencies.

Chapter 2 Goals

The basic aim of the ECIA Chapter 2 program is to improve elementary and secondary education (including pre-school education) for children attending both public and private schools. A major goal is to provide flexibility for the use of monies in accordance with the educational needs and priorities of state and local education agencies. Another goal is to greatly reduce the administrative and paperwork burden imposed on schools.

State Application

To participate in Chapter 2, a state is required to file an application with the U.S. Secretary of Education which: (a) designates the state education agency (SEA) as the agency responsible for the administration and supervision of activities funded with block grant revenues; (b) provides for active consultation between the SEA and a special advisory committee appointed by the governor; (c) sets forth the planned allocation of funds; (d) agrees to keep such records and provide such information as the Secretary of Education may reasonably require for fiscal audit and program evaluation; (e) provides for dissemination of public information about funds use and advisory committee recommendations; (f) provides for an annual program evaluation and (g) contains assurances of compliance with federal law.

Local Application

In order to receive Chapter 2 funds, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are required to submit project applications to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. As prescribed by law, a Chapter 2 application must:

1. set forth the planned allocation of funds among subchapters A, B, and C of the law and for the programs authorized by such subchapters which it intends to support, including the allocation of such funds required to implement section 586 (regarding the participation of private school students);

2. provide assurances of compliance with provisions of the law relating to such programs, including the participation of children enrolled in private, nonprofit schools in accordance with section 586;

3. agree to keep such records, and provide such information to the state educational agency as reasonably may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation, consistent with the responsibilities of the state agency under the law; and

4. in the allocation of funds for programs authorized by the law, and in the design, planning, and implementation of such programs, provide for systematic consultation with parents of children attending elementary and secondary schools in the area served by the local agency, with teachers and administrative personnel in such schools, and with other groups as may be deemed appropriate by the local educational agency.

Authorized Activities

Three subchapters--A (Basic Skills), B (Educational Improvement and Support Services), and C (Special Projects)--provide for a wide variety of educational programs and projects. Any public school district or private school may choose to address its needs in one particular area or in any combination of areas, subject only to the provisions of the law (and in the case of religious schools, subject to traditional interpretation of the Wisconsin constitution) the LEAs are permitted to expend grant funds with complete discretion. Specific subchapter educational activities and projects are delineated in the following manner.

Subchapter A: Basic Skills Development

Chapter 2 permits the use of funds to develop and implement a coordinated program designed to improve instruction in the basic skills. Basic skills are defined as: reading, mathematics, written and oral communications. Area-wide or district activities such as learning centers or demonstration programs for parents may also be included. Plans for programs shall be developed in conjunction with continuing consultation with teachers and principals. It shall include a systematic strategy for improving basic skills instruction for all children in the school building, involve teachers, administrators, and (to the extent practicable) parents, and utilize all available resources in a comprehensive program. The program might include:

1. diagnostic assessment to identify the needs of all children in the school;

2. the establishment of learning goals and objectives for children and for the school;

3. pre-service and in-service training and development programs for teachers, administrators, teacher aides and other support personnel, designed to improve instruction in the basic skills;

4. activities designed to enlist the support and participation of parents to aid in the instruction of their children; and

5. procedures for testing students and for evaluating the effectiveness of programs in maintaining a continuity of effort for individual children.

Subchapter B: Educational Improvement and Support Services

Activities may include the following:

1. The acquisition and utilization of: school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools which shall be used for instructional purposes only, and instructional equipment and materials suitable to academic subjects, for use by children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools for instructional purposes only. Expenditures in these areas should take into account the needs of children in both public and private schools based upon periodic consultation with teachers, librarians, media specialists, and private school officials.

2. The development of programs designed to improve educational practices in elementary and secondary schools including children in private schools. Emphasis may be focused on activities designed to address the educational problems of children with special needs (e.g., educationally deprived children, gifted and talented children, etc.).

3. Comprehensive guidance, counseling and testing programs in elementary and secondary schools, as well as state and local support services necessary for the effective implementation and evaluation of such programs (including those designed to help prepare students for employment).

4. Improvement of the planning, management, and implementation of educational programs, including fiscal management by both state and local educational agencies and the cooperation of such agencies with other public agencies.

5. Assistance in teacher training and in-service staff development, particularly to prepare personnel to deal with contemporary teaching and learning requirements, and to provide assistance in teaching educationally deprived students.

Subchapter C: Special Projects

The following activities may be supported with Chapter 2 funds:

1. metric education;
2. the arts in education;
3. partnership programs with parents of school-age children;
4. partnership programs with parents of preschool children, in cooperation with programs funded under the Headstart-Follow Through Act;
5. consumer education, community education;
6. relating academic skills and work experience in coordination with youth employment programs under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act;
7. career education;
8. environmental education;
9. health education;
10. programs to introduce disadvantaged secondary school students to careers in the biomedical and medical sciences;
11. use of public education facilities as community centers in conjunction with other local governmental agencies and community organizations and groups;
12. programs to identify, encourage, and meet the special educational needs of children who give evidence of high performance capability in such areas as: intellectual, creative, artistic, leadership capacity, or specific academic fields, and who require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school in order to fully develop such capabilities;
13. establishment of educational proficiency standards and programs designed to assist students in achieving proficiency in reading writing, mathematics, or other subjects;
14. safety education;
15. law education;
16. demographic education;
17. international understanding;
18. academic and vocational education of juvenile delinquents or youth offenders;
19. programs to reduce the incidence of crime and vandalism in the school environment;
20. ethnic heritage studies; and
21. programs involving training and advisory services under Title IV of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964.

State Advisory Committee

Any state or territory that receives Chapter 2 funds must establish an advisory committee. Members are appointed by the Governor and are determined to be broadly representative of the educational interests of the general public, including persons representative of:

1. public and private elementary and secondary school children;
2. classroom teachers;
3. parents of elementary and secondary school children;
4. local boards of education (district school advisory councils);
5. local and regional school administrators (including principals and superintendents);

PART ONE

EVALUATION
1984-1985

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHAPTER 2 ECIA PROGRAM IN WISCONSIN

TABLE 1

Chapter 2 Funding
1984-85 Program Year
July 1, 1984 - June 30, 1985

THE 1984-1985 WISCONSIN ALLOCATION IS $8,884,561

20% ($1,776,912) is used by DPI at the state level

80% ($7,107,649) is distributed to school districts and institutions

The formula for the distribution of 1984-1985 funds is based on:

50% enrollment (public + private September 1983)
50% of $7,107,649 = $3,553,824

45% "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" count
(October 1983 total AFDC count with no minimum payment required)

45% of $7,107,649 = $3,198,442

5% "Sparsity" factor

5% of $7,107,649 = $355,382 (to be distributed to the 106 districts within the most sparsely populated counties in Wisconsin)

The total 1983 Chapter 2 enrollment is 931,491 (public + private + institutions)

THE PER PUPIL ALLOTMENT BASED ON ENROLLMENT IS $3.815

$3,553,824 ÷ 931,491 = $3.815

The total October 1983 AFDC count is 99,362

THE PER PUPIL ALLOTMENT BASED ON AFDC COUNT IS $32.189

$3,198,442 ÷ 99,362 = $32.189

The total 1983 puplic and private school enrollment in the 106 school districts qualifying for the sparsity funds is 104,389

THE PER PUPIL ALLOTMENT BASED ON SPARSITY COUNT IS $3.40

$355,382 ÷ 104,389 = $3.40

TABLE 2

Complete Annual School Costs in Wisconsin Public School Districts for 1984-85

Total School Costs (in billions)	$2.91
Federal Share (including Chapter 2)	4.64%
Chapter 2 Share of Federal	6.61%
Chapter 2 Share of Total School Costs	.31%
State Aid and Credits (in billions)	$1.29
State Share of Total School Costs	38.06%
Local Share of Total School Costs	57.29%

Source: Bureau for State School Aids Administration and Consultation, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Note: Complete Annual School Cost is defined as the gross cost of the general, special project, debt service and food service funds, plus the net cost of the building fund. The CASC also reflects the subtraction of costs paid for by incoming transfers from other school districts.

1984-85 STATE LEVEL FUNDS

In 1984-85 the department retained 20% ($1,776,912) of the Chapter 2 allocation for statewide educational activities and programs. Five percent of the funds supported 12 innovative educational improvement projects. Fifteen percent of the funds supported positions which provide educational leadership to school districts as well as positions which strengthen educational improvement and support services at the state level. A total of 38.23 FTE positions were supported in 1984-85.

Private school children and teachers were involved in or benefited from the innovative educational improvement projects supported with Chapter 2 funds. In addition, the department invites private schools to participate in all state held conferences, workshops and training programs, involves private school staff in state educational committees and other activities that are relevant to the education of K-12 students, and upon request provides technical assistance to private schools. As a result, the staff charged to the Chapter 2 15% funds either directly or indirectly provide services to private schools.

TABLE 3

Chapter 2 Funded SEA Positions
1984-85
(15% State Level Funds)

	Full Time Equivalency Positions
Curriculum Development:	4.00
Graduation Equivalency Diploma Coordinator:	.50
Competency Testing:	1.00
State Assessment and Testing:	1.50
Pupil Services:	1.88
Management and Federal Aids:	5.75
Community Education:	1.00
Legal Services:	.50
Word Processing Center:	2.50
Fiscal Services:	3.00
General Services:	1.00
Policy and Budget	3.00
Education Information Services:	1.00
Education Publicity Services:	3.60
Personnel Services:	2.00
Office of State Superintendent:	3.00
Instructional Media & Educational Technology:	3.00
SUBTOTALS	38.23

TABLE 4

1984-85
Chapter 2 - 20% Funds
Direct Program Administration

The planning, supervising and fiscal accounting activities necessary to implement Chapter 2 grants to school districts.

FTE	Personnel Charged to 15% Funds	
1.00	Chapter 2 Coordinator	Bade, M.
.25	Account Specialist	Koscielniak, M.
.25	Secretary	Corey, D.
1.50		

Approximately 3% of the departments 20% funds are allocated for direct program administration activities.

TABLE 5

1984-85
State Level Discretionary Projects Representing
5 Percent of the Chapter 2 Grant

Project	Chapter 2 Allocation
Academic Decathlon	$54,000
Administrative Assessment Centers	55,000
Arts World	20,000
CCSSO Conference Planning (Council of Chief State School Officers Summer Institute)	10,000
Dropouts and Truance Program	56,000
Early Identification Program (Wisconsin Educational Opportunity Program)	19,200
Microcomputer Laboratory	30,000
Regional Service Units	47,300
School Improvement Initiatives	5,000
Science World	153,500
Teaching Incentives Pilot	
Performance Assessment	11,000
Testing	6,500
TOTAL	$467,500

FIVE PERCENT STATE LEVEL DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Academic Decathlon
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $54,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The Academic Decathlon is an international program which promotes academic excellence among students, schools and communities. The program achieves its purpose through state and international competition in ten academic areas.

The Academic Decathlon competition consists of six subject matter tests of academic strength (economics, language and literature, fine arts, mathematics, science, social sciences), three demonstrations of written and oral communications skills (interview, essay, speech), and a Super Quiz on a particular topic. Each high school team consists of six students made up of two students whose grade point average is no better than "C," two students whose grade point average is "B," and two students whose grade point average is "A." Thus the Academic Decathlon program offers the appeal of mental competition to all achievement levels of a high school.

In 1984-85, 200 high schools entered the qualifying phase of the competition. From this group of schools, 36 high schools competed in six regional meets and the State Academic Decathlon competition included nine high schools. The winner of the state contest represented Wisconsin at the International Academic Decathlon in Los Angeles, California on April 10, 1985.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Administrative Assessment Centers
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $55,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Administrative Assessment Centers is a program designed to identify building level administrative talent from among beginning elementary and secondary assistant principals and teachers who have administrative degrees or who are nearing completion of a degree program. There is also a developmental component for assessed candidates with minimal needs in a few of the twelve categories of administrative behaviors assessed in the centers.

The DPI worked with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), Association of Wisconsin School Administrators (AWSA), higher education and cooperating local school districts to develop an assessment model.

The ongoing program is administered by a full-time administrative officer and a half-time program assistant. Five assessment centers operate annually and assessors for the centers are local school district personnel trained by NASSP.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Arts World
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $20,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Arts World is an ongoing program which brings together high-school-aged artists, professional artists and teachers for an intensive summer experience in the arts.

- To expand access to professional-level artistic training for talented young artists without regard to economic status, cultural background or geographic location.

- To provide models of teaching and learning which can be useful to schools and communities in developing opportunities in all of the arts for all students.

- To provide a flexible learning environment which emphasizes creativity, individual expression and interdisciplinary experiences in the arts.

- To provide encouragement and career awareness to high-school-aged students who are talented and motivated in the arts.

- To provide a laboratory for young artists, teachers and professional artists to work and learn together.

The 1985 summer Arts World budget of $57,350 was supported by DPI ($20,000), Wisconsin Arts Board ($20,000), student fees ($12,000) and private donations ($5,350).

Sixty public and private high school students and ten teachers from public and private schools were selected for the two-week 1985 Arts World program.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: CCSSO Summer Institute
Division: State Superintendent's Office
Chapter 2 Funds: $10,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Herbert J. Grover, and the staff of the Department of Public Instruction hosted the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Summer Institute the week of July 28 to August 2, 1985.

The program itself was provided by CCSSO staff around the general theme of successful school and college collaboration to improve education. The institute provided first-hand information on such ventures.

Invitations to attend were issued to the nation's university systems' presidents.

The Council is a professional association whose only members are the heads of state departments of education for the fifty states and seven other extra-state jurisdictions.

Funds for the meeting came from the CCSSO and Foundation Grants, with the exception of a part-time coordinator and related expenditures which were funded by Wisconsin as the host state.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Dropouts and Truancy (Prevention)
Division: Handicapped Children and Pupil Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $56,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

This project provided continuity and development of new directions to the department's efforts to reduce truancy and dropout in the state's schools. During 1984-85, project activities were directed at (a) bridging previous DPI efforts in this area with planned future initiatives; (b) carrying out the major inservice and programmatic recommendations identified under Project STAY during 1983-84; (c) working with LEAs experiencing high truancy and dropout rates, especially those LEAs enrolling large concentrations of "at risk" students; and (d) preparing for implementation of the department's 1985-87 "at-risk" children's initiative.

Progress was achieved on the following objectives:

1. Provide statewide leadership and consultative activities to improve and expand student truancy and dropout prevention programs in school districts experiencing high rates of same.

2. Develop written guidelines and materials regarding student truancy and dropout prevention programming based on exemplary programs identified through research and examination.

3. Integrate DPI efforts regarding truancy and dropout prevention with other appropriate state, community, and local agencies.

4. Prepare evaluation and program reports and initiate and implement research and planning for dissemination activities relating to dropout and truancy prevention and intervention.

5. Provide leadership and follow-through on programmatic activities during 1984-85 related to the department's 1985-87 budget and legislative proposals for "at-risk" children.

Major Activities Conducted:

1. General assistance to all LEAs on request and availability basis for information dissemination, consultation and problem resolution, especially those LEAs with high concentrations of minority students or other "at-risk" populations (Objective #1).

2. Major inservice activities for LEAs experiencing high truancy and dropout rates - especially those LEAS enrolling large concentrations of "at-risk" students (Objective #2).

3. Interface with NDN, AODA, SAM, Alcohol and Traffic Safety, Chapter I Migrant Education, JTPA, pupil services and other program areas to aid LEAs in coordinating and focusing resources needed for truancy and dropout prevention/reduction efforts (Objective #3).

4. Pull together <u>current</u> profile data on truancy and dropouts in Wisconsin public schools (Objective #4).

5. Assist in planning to implement the agency's proposed 1985-87 "at-risk" children's initiative (Objective #5).

6. Work with section chief and other bureau staff to plan, conduct, and follow through on an invitational symposium for Milwaukee Area Minority Member Policy Makers Conference to address truancy and dropout among minority youth including statutory, legislative and programmatic issues (Objective #5).

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Early Identification Program WEOP (Wisconsin Educational Opportunity Program)
Division: School Financial Resources and Management Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $19,200

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

This project addressed the educational needs of students participating in the Wisconsin Educational Opportunity Program (WEOP). WEOP is a statewide program focusing on expanding and improving educational opportunities for minority and disadvantaged students. The funds requested for this project were used to prepare minority and disadvantaged students for postsecondary education. The program included three major components:

1. Slide Presentations - audiovisual equipment was purchased to present slide presentations for students, parents, community groups and school personnel on:

   a. student financial aid programs available at vocational institutions and colleges,
   b. how WEOP works (benefits students),
   c. how to prepare for college entrance (e.g., admission problems, housing information, counseling center, etc.).

2. Test Preparation - prepared students for taking standardized tests (PSAT, SAT, ACT). Standardized test preparation materials were made available to students, and staff taught the students how to use the materials.

3. Field Trips - junior and senior high school students were taken to vocational, industrial and higher education sites.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Microcomputer Lab
Division: Division for Library Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $30,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) provided a microcomputer lab unit for its staff, walk-in school district and private school faculty, and public librarians. The unit incorporated services of the DPI's library, Wisconsin Dissemination Program (WDP), and microcomputer lab into an instructional computing informational resource unit to provide and promote the use and demonstration of microcomputers and microcomputer software for informational, instructional and management needs.

In 1984-85, the microcomputer lab equipment and supplies were purchased (6 microcomputers, software, shelving, periodicals, etc). The lab became operational in July of 1984 and a full-time clerical assistant was hired to staff the lab. The lab is also staffed by existing library services personnel (a microcomputer specialist and a half-time clerical assistant).

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Regional Service Unit Grants
Division: Library Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $47,300

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Regional Service Units (RSUs) are geographically designated areas administered through six CESAs for the purpose of providing services which positively impact classroom use of instructional television and radio. RSUs provide five basic services including teacher inservice focusing on overall use of broadcast instruction and inservice on specific broadcast instruction programs and services.

The ECIA Chapter 2 funds were allocated to the six RSUs on an equal basis to assist them in providing services to school districts. Funds were also used by DPI to implement statewide efforts in ITV/radio utilization. Examples of such activities include: 1) staff development for all RSU directors, 2) development of ITV utilization materials, 3) promotion of ITV/RSU involvement in nonmember schools, 4) special projects with statewide implications relating to ITV/radio use, and 5) funding for state advisory committee meetings.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: School Improvement Initiatives
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $5,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

School Improvement Initiatives monies provide support for convening groups of educators to critique and validate a department-developed handbook for school improvement/school effectiveness in Wisconsin elementary and secondary schools. Participants in the critiquing and validating process are teachers, principals, superintendents, and CESA and university personnel. A handbook will be disseminated after the necessary rewriting occurs.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Science World
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $153,500

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Science World was a concept developed by DPI with the cooperation and assistance of the Wisconsin Academy of Science, Arts and Letters through their Center for the Advancement of Science Education and the Wisconsin Junior Academy. The program was designed to motivate students in science education at a time when they are still able to make decisions to pursue specialized science programs in their secondary school careers, and to reinforce the teaching skills of junior high school science teachers so they will be more effective in motivating their students.

Science World '84 serviced 360 eighth grade students, 120 junior high school science teachers, and included 18 lead teachers to assist in the instruction of the program. The program ran for six one-week sessions at the Pigeon Lake Field Station.

The immediate beneficiaries of Science World are the teacher and student participants. Expansion of the program reinforces the indirect benefits of the program (improved curriculum, highly trained teachers and improved students' skills) resulting from the participants' dissemination of the knowledge, skills and enthusiasm acquired from the program.

During the summer of 1984, 20% of the students were from nonpublic schools and 22% of the participating teachers were from nonpublic schools. In addition, one of the professional staff was from a nonpublic school.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1984-85
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Teacher Incentives Pilot
Division: Management and Budget
Chapter 2 Funds: $17,500 ($6,500 for Teacher Testing; $11,000 for Performance Assessment)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The State Superintendent's Teacher Testing Advisory Committee was appointed in January, 1985 to develop recommendations related to the testing of prospective and new teachers, as recommendated by the Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education. The committee met through June, 1985 to develop recommended methods by which the Task Force proposals could be implemented.

The State Superintendent's Performance Assessment Committee was appointed to develop statewide criteria for evaluation for all certified teachers. The performance assessment committee has met three times to develop these criteria for a performance instrument to be piloted by nine selected school districts. A fair and meaningful performance assessment process is crucial to the operation of career ladders and to the improvement of instructional quality. The committee is composed of district administrators, teachers and university professors.

1984-85
STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

During the 1984-85 Chapter 2 program year, the Wisconsin Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee (SAC) met 3 times. The SAC assists the Department of Public Instruction to perceive and implement ways to utilize available State-level Chapter 2 revenues effectively as well as review and choose components for the LEA funding formula. A list of the SAC for 1984-85 follows:

Leland Chenoweth
Route 2, Box 102
Blair, WI 54616
Representing: Local Boards of Education

John Dahm
1194 Dorchester Drive
Oconomowoc, WI 53066
Representing: Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Children

Senator J. M. Davis
410 South, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702
Representing: The State Legislature

Robert Ericson, Principal
North High School
1042 School Avenue
Sheboygan, WI 53081
Representing: Local and Regional School Administrators (including principals and superintendents)

Senatory Gary George
319 South, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702
Representing: The State Legislature

William A. Gollnick
P.O. Box 37
Oneida, WI 54155
Representing: Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Children

The Reverend John P. Hanley
3501 South Lake Drive
Milwaukee, WI 53207
Representing: Local and Regional School Administrators (including principals and superintendents)

Ray Heinzen
8492 Trout Drive
Marshfield, WI 54449
Representing: At-Large

Jean E. Hill
10588 Robinwood Court
Cedarburg, WI 53012
Representing: Parents of Elementary and Secondary School Children

Sandra Kinney
4471 East Balsam Lane
Rhinelander, WI 54501
Representing: At-Large

Ernest J. Korpela
P.O. Box 273
Cornucopia, WI 54826
Representing: Local and Regional School Administrators (including principals and superintendents)

John N. Kramer
1038 Lincoln Avenue
Fennimore, WI 53809
Representing: At-Large

Wallace Lindholm, Superintendent
Glenwood City School District
Highway 170
Glenwood City, WI 54013
Representing: Local and Regional School Administrators (including principals and superintendents)

Sylvia Loggin
P.O. Box 429
Stevens Point, WI 54481
Representing: Local and Regional School Administrators (including principals and superintendents)

Senator Barbara Lorman
140A South, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702
Representing: The State Legislature

Katherine Lyall
UW-Madison
1620 Van Hise Hall
Madison, WI 53706
Representing: Institutions of Higher Education

Mildred Perry
7744 South North Cape Road
Franklin, WI 53132
Representing: Local Board of Education

Martha Schmidt
3709 Zwerg Drive
Madison, WI 53705
Representing: Classroom Teachers

Marjorie Stemper
520 West Wisconsin Avenue
Oconomowoc, WI 53066
Representing: Classroom Teachers

Linda Stewart
3343 North 57th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53216
Representing: At-Large

Representative John Volk
112 North, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702
Representing: The State Legislature

Representative Polly Williams
48 North, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702
Representing: The State Legislature

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
125 South Webster Street • Box 7841 • Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent / B. Dean Bowles, Deputy State Superintendent

April 10, 1985

The Honorable Herbert J. Grover
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53707

Dear Dr. Grover:

As chairperson of the Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee, I am formally transmitting the committee's recommendations for distribution of education block grant funds in Wisconsin in 1985-86.

The committee recommends the allocation of block grant funds continue to provide 80 percent to local educational agencies and 20 percent to the state educational agency. The committee specified that 15 percent of the 20 percent continue to be used for state administrative expenses as determined by the State Superintendent in accordance with block grant regulations. The remaining 5 percent should continue to be used to fund one-time educational improvement programs.

In addition, the committee suggests the following guidelines (modified ~~from~~ 1984-85) be implemented for the 5 percent programs. The 5 percent programs should:

1. Ensure equitable opportunities for nonpublic and public schools to plan participation in the programs funded.

2. Describe activities with expected outcomes and evaluation procedures, including evidence of benefits to students and educational improvement.

3. Support experimental programs that exhibit potential for practical adaptation by LEAs.

4. Undergo review by the Program Subcommittee prior to commitment of funds.

5. Not be funded indefinitely with block grant funds.

The committee advises that the Department of Public Instruction establish a process for competitive mini grants that would serve as an incentive for innovative programs that can benefit LEAs. A maximum of $50,000 of the 5 percent funds should be set aside for grants that could range up to $5,000 each.

The committee further recommends continuation of the 1984-85 formula for the LEA allocation in 1985-86. The current formula distributes 50 percent based on school enrollment, 45 percent based on the high-cost factor identified as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and 5 percent based on the high-cost factor identified as sparsity. As in 1984-85, the total number of AFDC students in Wisconsin will be used to determine the AFDC factor.

The committee wishes to thank you for your encouragement and for the staff support provided through Brian Roherty and others at the Department of Public Instruction.

It has been a pleasure to chair the block grant committee, and I look forward to serving on the committee in 1985-86.

Sincerely,

Wallace L Lindholm

Wallace L. Lindholm, Chairman
Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee

pc
cc: Members of the Education Block Grant
State Advisory Committee

Brian M. Roherty, Assistant Superintendent
Division for Management and Budget

Minutes

EDUCATION BLOCK GRANT STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Madison, Wisconsin

December 19, 1984

The meeting of the Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee was held December 19, 1984 at General Executive Facility 3, 125 South Webster Street, Madison.

Committee members in attendance were Mr. Chenoweth, Mr. Dahm, Senator Davis, Mr. Ericson, Mr. Gollnick, Father Hanley, Mr. Heinzen, Ms. Kinney, Mr. Korpela, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Lindholm, Ms. Loggin, Dr. Lyall, Ms. Perry, Ms. Schmidt, Ms. Stemper, Representative Volk, and Representative Williams. Also present were Mr. Roherty and Mr. Sunby for the Department of Public Instruction and Ms. Sequiera for Senator Lorman.

Chairperson Lindholm called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. He informed the committee of Senator George's resignation because of responsibilities related to his role as co-chair of the Joint Finance Committee and of member Veledis Carter's death. Introductions were made.

Mr. Roherty gave a background report on Chapter 2 and provided materials. The committee was informed that initial appointments were made in January 1982 and the first meeting held in February 1982. Wisconsin receives approximately $9 million annually under the block grant. Federal law defines the makeup of the advisory committee and the types of representation. The block grant has a threefold purpose: (1) basic skills development, (2) educational improvement and support services, and (3) special projects. The DPI must match expenditures and objectives against these subparts. The basic question before the committee each year is how much advice and direction they should recommend to the State Superintendent regarding the use of funds. Primary debate has revolved around the distribution formula. Subcommittees were formed to look at the purposes of the law and to report to the committee. Ideally the committee should try to conclude its work by January or February, since the school districts are in the process of developing the next year's budgets at that time. This year it is the intent to present formula recommendations and other factors to the State Superintendent for consideration by the end of March. Each year DPI submits a three-year plan or an amendment to the plan to the U.S. Department of Education for approval.

Of the block grant money received in Wisconsin, 80 percent is required by law to flow through to the LEAs. The remaining 20 percent can flow through or be retained at the state level for statewide purposes. In the past, the advisory committee has voted to retain 20 percent at the state level. Of the 20 percent, 5 percent has been used for discretionary projects determined by the State Superintendent. The remaining 15 percent has been used for agency staffing.

Many positions formerly funded by ESEA Title V were transferred to block grant funding. At that time, the DPI reduced personnel expenditures from approximately $1.7 million to approximately $1.3 million. The department currently is at that level and will have to decide whether to go further into the 5 percent money or take other action (layoff, etc.). This issue will have to be addressed at a future advisory committee meeting. Positions which are funded by the 15 percent represent most of the support services ("nuts and bolts") of the agency.

Mr. Roherty discussed some of the special projects funded statewide by the discretionary funds (academic decathlon, gifted and talented study, college preparation brochure, etc.). These projects were provided seed money and will not receive additional block grant funding. The program subcommittee will go further in depth on these programs so the committee will have an opportunity to review and understand them.

Mr. Roherty discussed the reimbursement guidelines for the committee and provided an information sheet. He agreed the department would issue a letter which states that committee members are eligible to be considered for state rates for lodging in relation to their duties on the advisory committee.

Mr. Lindholm discussed the committee bylaws and distributed copies. Mr. Roherty emphasized that members must be present to vote. A member may have a representative attend for him or her, but that person cannot vote. A representative may be a full participant on the committee and have expenses reimbursed but may not vote.

The election of a chairperson elect was held. Mr. Heinzen nominated Mr. Kramer; seconded by Father Hanley. There being no other nominations, it was moved by Ms. Perry and seconded by Mr. Chenoweth that a unanimous ballot be cast for Mr. Kramer to serve as chairperson elect. The motion carried.

Mr. Lindholm stated the formula and program subcommittee structures would be retained if that is the wish of the committee. Persons who are interested in serving on a subcommittee should inform him. Father Hanley provided background information on establishment of the subcommittees for the purpose of saving meeting time for the committee. The subcommittees generally meet twice before presenting final reports, and the committee makes final decisions on subcommittee recommendations.

Mr. Roherty referred to the law which states that the role of the advisory committee is (1) to advise the state agency on the distribution formula, money reserved for SEA use, and money that flows through to LEAs, and (2) to plan, develop, support, implement, and evaluate state programs. The formula subcommittee looks at the formula (20%/80%) and the variables used to divide the money. The program subcommittee looks at basic skills versus special projects and the evaluation process. Mr. Lindholm stated that the formula is subject to change. The current formula is based on 50 percent enrollment, 45 percent AFDC, and 5 percent sparsity. The committee will look at the formula again, and the subcommittee will submit a recommendation for

committee action. Other high-cost allocations which must be considered are children from low-income families, children living in economically depressed urban and rural areas, and children living in sparsely populated areas.

Mr. Sunby distributed the LEA Chapter 2 handbook and commented on the 80 percent funds. Workshops were held in the fall for public and private schools. The DPI currently is processing this year's applications. A USDE program review of Wisconsin's 1981-82 and 1982-83 Chapter 2 programs showed a "clean audit" with no findings of noncompliance. School districts must apply for and identify the use and purpose of Chapter 2 funds. An application must be filed with DPI by the end of the calendar year. Every LEA receives their allocation based on the formula. Every district must plan their allocations with private schools within the district. The simplified paperwork has resulted in more applications by the districts. The question was raised of whether there are limitations based on such things as enrollment, statutes, etc. Mr. Sunby stated that the LEA allocation is predetermined by the approved formula. An LEA can apply for funds in a wide variety of categories as long as there is a planned educational purpose for use of the funds.

Mr. Lindholm reiterated that the committee must decide whether to continue with the formula and program subcommittees. Father Hanley moved that the subcommittees be retained. Seconded by Ms. Stemper. The motion carried.

Discussion was held on meeting schedules. Father Hanley stressed the importance of committee work being completed in time for the LEA budgeting process. It was agreed the final meeting will be held Friday, March 22, at which time a vote will be taken on the formula. Subcommittee meetings must be held in January and February and a public hearing held. The question of meeting locations was discussed. It was decided a meeting and public hearing will be held in Madison on Monday, February 11. A Madison location was chosen for the convenience of members who are legislators, since the Legislature will be in session at that time.

The subcommittees will be charged with providing information to DPI for distribution to LEAs, press, etc., in advance of the hearing. Mr. Lindholm and Mr. Roherty informed the membership that it was the committee's decision last year not to have printouts generated. The committee has the prerogative to change that directive, but there are always many changes, and it is very costly. Mr. Roherty stated that the advisory committee should direct DPI to prepare materials through the committee or subcommittee chairpersons. Mr. Lindholm agreed that all requests shall come through the committee or subcommittee chairpersons.

Mr. Chenoweth asked for more detail on what the subcommittees will address and what their responsibilities are. Mr. Roherty stated that the original charge is contained in previous meeting minutes and will be provided to the committee. Mr. Lindholm stated that the formula subcommittee will discuss the final formula allocation to be recommended to the State Superintendent, and the program subcommittee will deal with the various programs, LEA evaluations, and use of discretionary funds by the SEA.

Persons who are interested in serving on a subcommittee should inform Mr. Lindholm today or in the immediate future. He indicated that subcommittee appointments are made each year. Mr. Lindholm will work with Mr. Roherty in scheduling the meetings. It was pointed out that new subcommittee appontments are made each year, and only members of the individual subcommittee may vote although others may attend and provide input.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

pc

MINUTES

Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee
Madison, Wisconsin

February 21, 1985

The Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee met February 21, 1985 in General Executive Facility 3, 125 South Webster Street, Madison.

Committee members in attendance were Mr. Chenoweth, Mr. Dahm, Mr. Ericson, Ms. Kinney, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Lindholm, Ms. Loggin, Senator Lorman, Dr. Lyall, Ms. Stemper, Ms. Stewart, and Representative Volk. Also present were Mr. Roherty and Ms. Achtor of the Department of Public Instruction.

Chairman Lindholm called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. and immediately convened the public hearing to receive testimony related to the block grant program in Wisconsin and the formula to be used for distribution of block grant funds in 1985-86. Testimony was presented by John Tomasich, Menominee Indian School District; Charles Neff, UW-River Falls; Patricia Meloy, Wisconsin Association of Nonpublic Schools; and Jack Marcussen, Milwaukee Public Schools. Following testimony from all parties present, the chairman closed the public hearing and resumed the business portion of the meeting.

Mr. Lindholm informed the committee that, due to circumstances beyond their control, neither he nor Mr. Roherty were able to attend the National Chapter 2 Conference in Washington, D.C., on February 10-12. The United States Department of Education (USDE) will forward conference materials to the Department of Public Instruction, and this information will be shared with the committee.

Mr. Roherty reviewed the Chapter 2 law and distributed copies of a handbook, The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981--A Manual for Local Policy Makers and Administrators. He also explained Chapter 2 expenditures for the 1984-85 school year under the three subparts of the law. (Handout: ECIA Chapter 2 Anticipated Expenditures for School Year 1984-85.) The results of the 1983-84 USDE audit of the Wisconsin Chapter 2 program were discussed.

The committee discussed the LEA/SEA distribution of funds for 1985-86. The chairman reminded the committee that in the past 80 percent of the Chapter 2 allocation has been distributed to LEAs, and 20 percent has been retained by the state for administrative purposes. Ms. Stemper made a motion that the same formula (80%/20%) for the LEA/SEA distribution of Chapter 2 funds be retained in 1985-86. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dahm. The motion was passed unanimously without further discussion.

At Mr. Lindholm's request, Ms. Loggin, Program Subcommittee chairman, reported on the subcommittee's January 31 meeting. The subcommittee recommends the state continue to set aside 5 percent of the block grant funds for special projects. In addition, the subcommittee discussed the projects funded in 1983-84 and

requested from the DPI a brief summary evaluating each project and a brief explanation of the accomplishments of each. The subcommittee will meet after the full committee meeting February 21 (today) to discuss the information received from DPI and will begin formalizing recommendations for the use of 5 percent funds in 1985-86.

Mr. Roherty provided a brief overview on the department's use of 5 percent set aside funds in 1984-85. He informed the committee that the department's annual operating budget of $20-$30 million is budgeted for specific purposes. The Legislature does not appropriate any of these funds to DPI for creative projects. Therefore, the Chapter 2 set aside funds ($500,000) enable the DPI to try some innovative programs. The department has requested state funding in its 1985-87 budget for many of the 1984-85 projects. The department does not want to use the 5 percent block grant funds for permanent projects. If state funding is not approved for Science World, the State Superintendent may decide to continue using block grant funds to support it or decide to charge fees. If state funding is not approved for some of the other 5 percent projects, the department may decide not to fund them.

Mr. Roherty informed the committee that he had met with Mr. Neff of UW-River Falls to discuss their proposal for use of 5 percent set aside funds. At that time, he did not offer Mr. Neff much hope for funding, since the State Superintendent has been reluctant to allocate funds outside the elementary and secondary school system. However, if the committee recommends funds be allocated for such projects, Mr. Roherty believes the State Superintendent would follow their advice. Mr. Roherty asked the committee to provide some guidance to the department on how "outside" proposals should be handled. The law does not preclude school districts from using their allocations for such projects. Mr. Roherty said the State Superintendent would want some assurance from LEAs that they would pledge their block grant dollars (or part of them) to an outside proposal, such as the River Falls proposal, before the department would provide facilitation money to start the project. The Program Subcommittee will discuss the funding of outside projects at the February 21 meeting (today). Recommendations will be made at the March 22 committee meeting on how such projects should be handled.

In the absence of Mr. Korpela, Formula Subcommittee chairman, Mr. Lindholm asked Mr. Ericson, a member of the subcommittee, to report on the results of the January 30 subcommittee meeting. Mr. Ericson reported the subcommittee suggests the 1984-85 block grant formula be retained until after the hearing on February 21. The subcommittee plans to finalize its formula recommendations for 1985-86 distribution of funds. Mr. Lindholm reminded the committee that the committee has recommended a different formula each year since the block grant program began in 1982-83. (Handout: Distribution of Chapter 2 Block Grant Funds to Wisconsin School Districts.) Mr. Lindholm reviewed the three formulas with the committee and suggested the subcommittee look at high-cost factors used by other states before finalizing their recommendation. (This information was provided to the subcommittee at their January meeting.)

Mr. Roherty informed the committee he would be unable to attend the meeting on March 22 because of another commitment. After discussion on changing the meeting date, the committee agreed to change the starting time (2:00 p.m. rather than 1:00 p.m.). Both subcommittees will meet the morning of March 22. Mr. Lindholm emphasized the importance of attendance by all members at the March 22 meeting, because a quorum must be present to vote on the formula.

There being no other business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Bettejane Achtor
Secretary

MINUTES

Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee

Madison, Wisconsin

March 22, 1985

The Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee met March 22, 1985 in General Executive Facility 3, 125 South Webster Street, Madison.

Committee members in attendance were Mr. Chenoweth, Mr. Dahm, Mr. Ericson, Mr. Gollnick, Father Hanley, Mr. Korpela, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Lindholm, Ms. Loggin, Ms. Perry, Ms. Schmidt, Ms. Stemper, and Representative Volk. Also present were Mr. Roherty, Ms. Achtor, Mr. Sunby, and Ms. Bade of the Department of Public Instruction.

Chairman Lindholm called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and requested the committee to formally approve the minutes from the February 21 meeting. A motion was made by Ms. Stemper to adopt the minutes, and Representative Volk seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted.

At Mr. Lindholm's request, Ms. Loggin, program subcommittee chairman, reported on the subcommittee's morning meeting. The subcommittee recommendations for the use of the Chapter 2 block grant 20 percent funds in 1985-86 were presented. (Handout: Program Subcommittee Recommendations, March 22, 1985) Father Hanley moved to adopt the recommendations, and Mr. Kramer seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted.

At Mr. Lindholm's request, Mr. Korpela, formula subcommittee chairman, reported on the subcommittee's morning meeting. The subcommittee reviewed the testimony provided at the February 21 public hearing. The following questions were raised:

1. Are Native American children included in the AFDC high-cost factor for distributing Chapter 2 block grant funds to LEAs?

2. Should Native American children under the Relief for Needy Indian Persons (RNIP) program be added to the AFDC count?

Roger Sunby stated that Native American children are included in the AFDC count. The Department of Health and Social Services identifies students from families receiving RNIP as comparable to students from families in other parts of the state receiving general relief. The subcommittee voted in favor of continuing to define the need factor as AFDC count only. It was agreed not to include the RNIP or other general relief programs as part of the AFDC factor for distributing Chapter 2 block grant funds to LEAs. The subcommittee recommended that the full committee adopt the 1984-85 formula (50 percent based on school enrollment, 45 percent based on the high-cost factor identified as AFDC, and 5 percent based on the high-cost factor identified as sparsity) for distributing block grant funds to LEAs in 1985-86. Mr. Korpela made a motion that the committee adopt the subcommittee's recommendation, and Father Hanley seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Lindholm thanked the committee for their work and offered a special thank you to the subcommittees. He informed the committee that, according to committee bylaws, the 1985-86 committee meetings will be chaired by Chairman-elect Kramer.

On behalf of the State Superintendent, Mr. Roherty commended the committee for their work and assured them their recommendations will be well received by the State Superintendent. He suggested that at the first meeting in the fall he present the type of policy direction the department plans to pursue over the next one to three years. Hopefully, this will establish a context for looking at the Chapter 2 program. Mr. Roherty asked that committee members who may have other ideas on how the department could do a better job for the committee to contact him.

There being no other business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Bettejane Achtor
Secretary

1984-85
CHAPTER 2 LEA EVALUATION SURVEY RESULTS

How well did you accomplish the education improvements planned with your 1984-85 funds?

	Number	Percent
Very Well	235	55
To Our Satisfaction	176	41
To Our Partial Satisfaction	15	4
Not Satisfactory	0	0
Plans Were Changed	1	-
Total Reporting	427	100

"EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS"

Educational Outcomes Achieved Through Chapter 2 During 1984-1985

A list of expected Chapter 2 outcomes was compiled from objectives submitted by LEAs on their applications. These expected outcomes are as follows:

- That students gain knowledge and improve their skills in a specified curricular area.
- That students' attitudes improve; that motivation for learning improve.
- That students be more meaningfully and actively involved in the learning process.
- That students' retention and application of learning be improved.
- That more students would achieve success in school work.
- That parents and community be more meaningfully and actively involved in the education process.
- That teachers be better able to teach to objectives at appropriate levels of difficulty.
- That teachers be better able to monitor student progress and adjust instruction appropriately.
- That staff morale improve.
- That instructional leadership be improved.
- That there be a more positive, orderly school climate.
- That there be fewer behavior problems, including alcohol and other drug abuse.
- That high expectations for students and staff be fostered and accepted.
- That emphasis on basic skills increases.
- That clear goals for the instructional program be set.
- That a specific plan to reach the instructional goals be devised.
- That resources (funds, materials, time and staff) be directed toward achieving specific instructional goals.

- That coherence, coordination, consistency and continuity of instruction be improved.

The 1984-1985 Evaluation Survey asked Chapter 2 recipients to check the above statements that most closely describe their Chapter 2 outcomes for 1984-1985. The following table shows the distribution of responses by number and percent of respondents.

"EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS" OUTCOMES OF CHAPTER 2 LEA FUNDS
1984-1985

Outcome Achieved	Number of Respondents Who Checked Item	Percentage of Total Respondents
Students gained knowledge and improved their skills in curriculum area(s).	381	89%
Students were more meaningfully and actively involved in the learning process.	349	82%
Students attitudes improved; motivation for learning was better.	323	76%
Teachers were better able to teach to objectives at appropriate levels of difficulty.	294	69%
Resources (funds, materials, time, staff) were directed toward achieving specific instructional goals.	279	65%
Students' retention and application of learning improved.	231	54%
Emphasis on basic skills increased.	230	54%
More students achieved success in school work.	226	53%
Coherence, coordination, consistency and continuity of instruction were improved.	211	49%
Staff morale improved.	178	42%
Teachers were better able to monitor student progress and adjust instruction appropriately.	175	41%
Clear goals for the instructional program were set.	159	37%
Parents/community were more meaningfully and actively involved in the education process.	155	36%
High expectations for students and staff were fostered and accepted.	151	35%

Outcome Achieved	Number of Respondents Who Checked Item	Percentage of Total Respondents
Instructional leadership was improved.	144	34%
A specific plan to reach the instructional goals was devised.	129	30%
There was a more positive, orderly school climate.	91	21%
There were fewer behavior problems including alcohol and other drug abuse.	49	12%

1984-85
CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM USES OF FUNDS BY LEAS

	Number	Percent
Improvement of Administrative Practices	37	9
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse	35	8
Art	43	10
Community Education	17	4
Driver Education	6	1
EEN - Exceptional Education	52	12
English/Language Arts	148	35
Reading	139	33
Composition	81	19
Speech	25	6
Dramatic Arts	16	4
Environmental Education	21	5
Family Education/Parent Partnership	18	4
Foreign Languages	27	6
Gifted and Talented Program	96	23
Guidance/Counseling	82	19
Health	35	8
Learning Disadvantaged Programs	54	13
Library/IMC Program	213	50
Mathematics	186	44
Music	42	10
Physical Education	18	4
Preschool	9	2
Program for Students "At Risk"	29	7
Limited English Proficiency Programs	8	2
Science	147	34
Social Studies	128	30
Vocational Curriculum	37	9
Agriculture	35	8
Business/Distributive Education	67	16
Home Economics/Consumer Education	27	6
Industrial Education	49	14

1984-85
USES OF FUNDS FOR COMPUTERS IN EDUCATION

	Number	Percent
Planning For Use of Computers	63	15
Curriculum Development For Computer Education	72	17
Inservice/Training For Use of Computers	75	18
Computer Education	103	24
Computer Managed Education	45	11
Computer Personnel	20	5
Computer Hardware Acquisition	235	55
Computer Software Acquisition	162	38
Office Automation	38	9
Management Information Systems	15	4

1984-85
METHODS OF PARENT AND TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN CHAPTER 2

	Parents	Percent	Teachers	Percent
Chapter 2 Advisory Committee	170	40	201	47
Chapter 2 Meetings/Hearings	120	28	144	34
Newsletters/Newspaper Articles	212	50	142	33
Open Houses/PTO	164	38	100	23
Other Advisory Committees	101	24	109	26
Other Meetings	75	18	125	29
Proposal Review Groups	52	12	91	21
School Board Meetings	310	73	181	42
Telephone/Letters	72	17	63	15

TABLE 6

ECIA CHAPTER 2 STUDENT PARTICIPANTS AND EXPENDITURES
FOR 1984-85 AS REPORTED ON LEA APPLICATIONS

Subchapter A - Basic Skills Development

Category	Public School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Reading	$43,715	0.57	17
Mathematics	9,460	0.12	11
Written and Oral Communication	40,034	0.52	10
Comprehensive Program	19,473	0.25	11
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER A	$112,682	1.47	

Category	Private School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Reading	$6,008	0.08	9
Mathematics	2,906	0.04	5
Written and Oral Communication	4,943	0.06	6
Comprehensive Program	954	0.01	1
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER A	$14,811	0.19	

Subchapter B - Education Improvement and Support Services

Category	Public School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Library/Media Materials	$525,227	6.87	171
Textbooks	88,045	1.15	38
Instructional Equipment	2,983,226	39.03	329
Local Improvement Program	668,656	8.75	85
Program for Minority Children	28,505	0.37	5
Guidance/Counseling/Testing	95,985	1.26	28
Improvement of Educational Planning	107,232	1.40	29
Teacher Training/In-Service Staff Development	346,699	4.54	70
Desegregation Programs	1,414,900	18.51	2
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER B	$6,258,475	81.89	

Category	Private School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Library/Media Materials	$122,280	1.60	87
Textbooks	821,397	10.75	162
Instructional Equipment	4,209	0.06	3
Local Improvement Program	4,959	0.06	6
Program for Minority Children	0	0.00	0
Guidance/Counseling/Testing	1,969	0.03	4
Improvement of Educational Planning	0	0.00	0
Teacher Training/In-Service Staff Development	9,783	0.13	7
Desegregation Programs	0	0.00	0
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER B	$964,597	12.62	

Subchapter C - Special Projects

Category	Public School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Metric Education	$0	0.00	0
Arts in the Curriculum	$35,689	0.47	15
In-school and Pre-school Parent Partnership	18,183	0.24	4
Consumer Education	1,500	0.02	1
Preparation for Employment	2,618	0.03	3
Career Education	26,193	0.34	13
Environmental/Health/Law-related/Population/ International Understanding	53,419	0.70	11
Academic and Vocational Education for Offenders	0	0.00	0
Biomedical/Medical Science Career Education for Disadvantaged	2,577	0.03	2
Gifted and Talented Education	118,035	1.54	31
Competency Standards Program	14,814	0.19	8
Safe Schools Program	300	0.00	1
Ethnic Heritage Studies	2,113	0.03	2
Civil Rights Training	442	0.01	1
Community Education	8,749	0.11	6
Other	3,900	0.05	2
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER C	$288,532	3.78	

Category	Private School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Metric Education	$0	0.00	0
Arts in the Curriculum	$2,995	0.04	3
In-school and Pre-school Parent Partnership	0	0.00	0
Consumer Education	0	0.00	0
Preparation for Employment	0	0.00	0
Career Education	0	0.00	0
Environmental/Health/Law-related/Population/ International Understanding	0	0.00	0
Academic and Vocational Education for Offenders	0	0.00	0
Biomedical/Medical Science Career Education for Disadvantaged	0	0.00	0
Gifted and Talented Education	400	0.01	1
Competency Standards Program	0	0.00	0
Safe Schools Program	0	0.00	0
Ethnic Heritage Studies	0	0.00	0
Civil Rights Training	0	0.00	0
Community Education	0	0.00	0
Other	0	0.00	0
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER C	$3,395	0.04	

PART TWO

EVALUATION
1985-1986

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHAPTER 2 ECIA PROGRAM IN WISCONSIN

TABLE 7

Chapter 2 Funding
1985-86 Program Year
July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1986

THE 1985-86 WISCONSIN ALLOCATION IS $9,749,882

20% ($1,949,976) is used by DPI at the state level

80% ($7,799,906) is distributed to school districts and institutions

The formula for the distribution of 1985-86 funds is based on the same factors used last year:

50% enrollment (public + private September 1984)
50% of $7,799,906 = $3,899,953

45% "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" count
(October 1984 total AFDC count with no minimum payment required)

45% of $7,799,906 = $3,509,958

5% "Sparsity" factor

5% of $7,799,906 - $389,995 (to be distributed to the 106 districts within the most sparsely populated counties in Wisconsin)

The total 1984 Chapter 2 enrollment is 923,293 (public + private + institutions)

THE PER PUPIL ALLOTMENT BASED ON ENROLLMENT IS $4.22

$3,899,953 ÷ 923,293 = $4.22

The total October 1984 AFDC count is 101,823

THE PER PUPIL ALLOTMENT BASED ON AFDC COUNT IS $34.47

$3,509,958 ÷ 101,832 = $34.47

The total 1984 public and private school enrollment in the 106 school districts qualifying for the sparsity funds is 103,389

THE PER PUPIL ALLOTMENT BASED ON SPARSITY COUNT IS $3.77

$389,995 ÷ 103,389 = $3.77

TABLE 8

Complete Annual School Costs in Wisconsin Public School Districts for 1985-86

Total School Costs (in billions)	$3.14
Federal Share (including Chapter 2)	6.65%
Chapter 2 Share of Federal	4.67%
Chapter 2 Share of Total School Costs	.31%
State Aid and Credits (in billions)	$1.46
State Share of School Costs	36.13%
Local Share of Total School Costs	59.19%

Source: Bureau for State School Aids Administration and Consultation, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Note: Complete Annual School Cost is defined as the gross cost of the general, special project, debt service and food service funds, plus the net cost of the building fund. The CASC also reflects the subtraction of costs paid for by incoming transfers from other school districts.

1985-86 STATE LEVEL FUNDS

In 1985-86 the department retained 20% ($1,949,976) of the Chapter 2 allocation for statewide educational activities and programs. Five percent of the funds supported 15 innovative educational improvement projects. Fifteen percent of the funds supported positions which provide educational leadership to school districts as well as positions which strengthen educational improvement and support services at the state level. A total of 43.43 FTE positions were supported in 1985-86.

Private school children and staff were involved in or benefited from the innovative educational improvement projects supported with Chapter 2 funds. In addition, the department invites private schools to participate in all state held conferences, workshops and training programs, involves private school staff in state educational committees and other activities that are relevant to the education of K-12 students, and upon request provides technical assistance to private schools. As a result, the staff charged to the Chapter 2 15% funds either directly or indirectly provide services to private schools.

TABLE 9

Chapter 2 Funded SEA Positions
1985-86
(15% State Level Funds)

	Full Time Equivalency Positions
Curriculum Development:	4.00
Graduation Equivalency Diploma Coordinator:	.50
Competency Testing:	1.00
State Assessment and Testing:	1.50
Pupil Services:	2.08
Management and Federal Aids:	5.75
Community Education:	1.00
Legal Services:	.50
Word Processing Center:	2.50
Fiscal Services:	3.00
General Services:	1.00
Policy and Budget	3.00
Education Information Services:	1.00
Education Publicity Services:	3.60
Equal Education Opportunity:	4.00
Personnel Services:	2.00
Office of State Superintendent:	3.00
Instructional Media & Educational Technology:	4.00
SUBTOTALS	43.43

TABLE 10

1985-86
Chapter 2 - 20% Funds
Direct Program Administration

The planning, supervising and fiscal accounting activities necessary to implement Chapter 2 grants to school districts.

FTE	Personnel Charged to 15% Funds	
1.00	Chapter 2 Coordinator	Bade, M.
.25	Account Specialist	Koscielniak, M.
.25	Secretary	Corey, D.
1.50		

Approximately 3% of the departments 20% funds are allocated for direct program administration activities.

TABLE 11

1985-86
Evaluation of Services
Provided With State Level 15% Funds

During 1985-86 there were 42 state agency staff funded totally or partially by Chapter 2 funds retained at the state level. These funds represented 15% of the total grant.

Supervisors were asked to rate Chapter 2-funded personnel on the quality of services provided. The rating was done on a four point scale with "1" meaning below average quality of services, "2" meaning average quality, "3" meaning high quality, and "4" meaning extremely high quality of services.

Supervisors rated the services of twenty-four staff members to be of extremely high quality, seventeen to be of high quality, and one to be of average quality. No one was rated below average.

TABLE 12

1985-86
State Level Discretionary Projects Representing
5 Percent of the Chapter 2 Grant

Project Title	Chapter 2 Allocation
Academic Decathlon	$53,131
Administrative Assessment Centers	31,000
Arts World	41,000
Dropout and Truancy Program	20,000
Microcomputer Laboratory	16,000
Microcomputer Utilization	9,700
Regional Service Units	47,500
School Finance Studies	35,000
School Improvement Program	6,500
Science World	23,900
Teaching Incentive Pilot	
Performance Assessment	1,400
Testing	1,500
UW-Platteville Middle School Project	25,600
WEOP-Early Identification Program	25,000
Wisconsin Improvement Program	14,594
TOTAL	$351,825

FIVE PERCENT STATE LEVEL DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Academic Decathlon
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $53,131

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

All public and private schools were contacted to attend regional meetings. Application information was provided both public and private high schools.

Two hundred twenty nine high schools were participants in the qualifying level of Academic Decathlon.

Six regional contests with 9 schools each were conducted and a state meet involving 9 schools was held.

The Wisconsin representative to the United States Academic Decathlon finished 7th in the nation. This is an excellent achievement considering there were 41 states participating.

Small schools were included and participated in all levels of competition. As a matter of fact, a small school was the state champion.

Wisconsin has been recognized as one of the three top states in the United States Academic Decathlon program. Only California and Texas have more participants.

Actual number of public schools involved.	219
Actual number of public school students involved.	1,971
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	876
Actual number of private schools involved.	10
Actual number of private school students involved.	90
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	40

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Administrative Assessment Center
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $31,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Five assessment centers were held and 54 participants were assessed. The dates were as follows:

- December 9-10, 1985
- January 6-7, 1986
- February 3-4, 1986
- February 10-11, 1986
- April 14-15, 1986

Two persons were trained as assessors. No more were trained because of great number of experienced assessors agreed to continue in the program for an additional year.

Feedback was provided to 54 individuals. Final assessment center reports are on file. Feedback was given within three weeks of conclusion of each center.

Actual number of school districts involved.	40
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	98
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	2

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Arts World
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $41,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The program has been developed in the five areas of visual art, theater, music, creative writing and dance.

All students selected from private and public high schools have demonstrated excellence in an art form and a willingness to participate in a second art form.

The Arts World program has selected some of the very best teachers and professional artists in the state of Wisconsin.

A teacher inservice component has been strengthened considerably. The number of applications was nearly 90 and we selected 30. This is an increase from 4 participants last year.

Arts World has been strengthened because of support received from outside agencies, notably among these is the Wisconsin Arts Board.

Actual number of public school students involved.	121
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	27
Actual number of private school students involved.	7
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	1

All school districts were provided information in regard to the Arts World program. A uniqueness of the Arts World program is the inclusion of 5 art forms rather than the focus on only one. In addition, a major strength of the program is the utilization of both professional artists and classroom teachers. The evaluation results of the teacher participant component were outstanding.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Dropout and Truancy Program
Division: Handicapped Children and Pupil Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $20,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Designed and implemented statewide a school and community staff development model to assist in truant and dropout identification, need assessment and service. Staff development programs were conducted through CESA sponsored conferences and professional development workshops hosted by school pupil services, administration, vocational education, JTPA, and health and social services professional organizations. Approximately 25 workshops were conducted with local school personnel.

Produced and assisted in the direction of a series of truancy and dropout prevention radio spots to be aired as public service announcements, Fall, 1986. Actors include the State Superintendent, parents, and students who stress the importance of school attendance and achievement.

Designed a Wisconsin statewide survey format to determine relationships between various local school and community programming efforts and truancy/dropout rates. Visited and consulted with leaders of nationally acknowledged truancy and dropout prevention programs in Denver, CO; Houston, TX; Richmond, VA; Baltimore, MD; and Washington, DC. Conducted extensive research on the causes and solutions of school truancy and dropout. Research was collated to form the basis of the department's Children At Risk legislative proposals and the Wisconsin "Children At Risk Resource and Planning Guide."

Established a department Intra-Agency Committee to integrate programs managed by the department serving children at risk preschool through 12th grade. Initiated a policy level Inter-Agency Committee with the Department of Health and Social Services to integrate children at risk program efforts. Highlighted the school/community/family/business/industry roll in the statewide children at risk implementation effort.

Prepared and printed a comprehensive Wisconsin "Children at Risk Resource and Planning Guide" to serve as a functional road map for local truancy and dropout prevention and intervention. Included was an annotated bibliography of resources and successful programs available in Wisconsin and nationally.

Sponsored and conducted a series of 12 statewide regional workshops hosted by Wisconsin CESAs to inservice local school staff, school board, and community members regarding the Wisconsin Children at Risk legislation. Approximately 328 of Wisconsin's 432

school districts (76%) sent staff teams to the conferences. Presented major workshops at 15 other professional development conferences during Spring, 1986.

Conducted a major survey research effort involving all Wisconsin school districts in order to identify children at risk issues and program solutions. Over 90% of the school districts completed the survey and nominated effective children at risk programs currently operating in local schools and communities. The survey was conducted in conjunction with the University of Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. Research findings and an annotated bibliography of successful programs have been published in the "Children At Risk Resource and Planning Guide." Collated research findings of survey research and program visitations.

Designed a format for a Milwaukee Minority Policy Shapers Conference to ensure school/community/business/family/industry collaboration in solutions to the minority school dropout problem in Milwaukee. Minority educational and political groups are currently exploring the viability of such a conference.

Actual number of school district involved.	333
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	2,800
Actual number of private schools involved.	10
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	30

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Microcomputer Center/Library (MCL)
Division: Library Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $16,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

This grant paid for the support staff position (Library Services Assistant 2 LSA2) for the Microcomputer Center/Library.

A neutral setting has been provided for Wisconsin K-12 educators to examine microcomputers and instructional software. One hundred twenty software packages have been added to the collection.

Access has been provided to all major sources of published reviews and evaluations of instructional software to Wisconsin K-12 educators.

State-of-the-art information about all aspects of instructional computing at the K-12 level has been provided via collection development, regional workshops (6 in 1985-86) and in-house workshops (3 in 1985-86).

The DPI Microcomputer Center/Library served as a model for the 12 CESA microcomputer labs.

CESA personnel were given online training during July, 1985; library systems and CESA special education personnel were given online training and demonstrations for times during FY 86. Ongoing telephone consulting is provided.

State-of-the-art online information was provided for 900 requests. CESAs provided an additional 350 online searches.

The MCL ERIC collection documents were sent to 900 requesters during FY 86. The Chapter 2 funded staff person provided all work related to this service.

Work was begun on providing a model of library automation applications for small public libraries and school libraries.

The LSA2 uses microcomputer databases for journal check-in and records, circulation records, and overdue notices.

The LSA2 provides all interlibrary loans to DPI staff on a daily basis. Items are usually received within one week.

Professional services are provided by the librarians since clerical work is done by the LSA2. Professional services include

reference questions, collection development, online searches, bibliography preparation. Each month the LSA2 routes 500 journal table of contents or newsletters to DPI staff.

Actual number of school districts involved.	250
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	1,400
Actual number of private schools involved.	10
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	20

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Microcomputer Utilization
Division: School Financial Resources and Management Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $9,700

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Purchase and installation of a microcomputer system and printer for use in the Chapter 2 program, private school consultation, the community education program, the home-based education program and working with Wisconsin's twelve Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs).

Use of the microcomputer system for Chapter 2 application acknowledgement and approval letters, the newsletter, survey analysis and other data analysis, and for various reporting requirements. Similar uses are made of the system for work with programs affecting private schools, home-based education, community education and CESA coordination.

Actual number of school districts involved.	429 districts (in Chapter 2)
Actual number of public school students involved.	768,000
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	40,000
Actual number of private schools involved.	619 (in Chapter 2)
Actual number of private school students involved.	102,000 (in Chapter 2)
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	Those in 619 schools

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Regional Service Units
Division: Library Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $47,500

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

This project improved the educational opportunities of Wisconsin students through better use of broadcast instruction resources. This was accomplished through the partial support of each of six Regional Service Units (RSUs) with ECIA funds provided to the Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) supervising RSU staff. Other accomplishments:

- Provided ITV/radio inservices to teachers/administrators.
- Provided preservice "training" to future teachers.
- Each RSU held an annual conference for building-level contact people either in the Fall of 1985 or the Spring of 1986. Several RSU directors used DPI and ECB staff as presenters.
- Each RSU produced a monthly newsletter.
- All RSU-member schools had access to a tape dubbing service through the Educational Communications Board (ECB).
- An ongoing selection and evaluation process utilized RSU directors in terms of their personal expertise and in terms of their assistance in identifying area educators who participate in area committees.
- All RSU directors provided information on telecommunications technology. Access to ITV technical services was provided by each RSU.

Actual number of school districts involved.	323
Actual number of public school students involved.	720,000
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	28,800
Actual number of private schools involved.	173

Actual number of private school students involved.	25,850
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	1,038

Based upon written evidence provided through the end-of-year evaluation of each RSU, comments of school representatives on each RSU's advisory committee, the project has been very successful. The Chapter 2 set-aside funds have made it possible to equalize costs to member schools throughout Wisconsin. Thus, the goal of improving educational opportunities of Wisconsin students throughout Wisconsin through broadcast instruction, while a continuing goal, is being achieved.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: School Finance Studies
Division: School Financial Resources and Management Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $35,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The Department of Public Instruction School Finance Study Committee was organized in January, 1986. The committee of eight persons, seven from DPI and one from UW-Madison, met regularly since February, 1986. In addition to its internal study and discussion, the committee has heard from about 25 groups and individuals associated in some way with school finance.

The committee will be submitting its report to the State Superintendent in August, 1986. Its goals were defined and have been met as follows:

1. Review school finance practices, procedures and trends in Wisconsin and the nation.

   - this has been done in a very thorough manner through discussion, study, and interaction with other groups and individuals.

2. Identify the most crucial issues confronting school finance in Wisconsin currently and in the future.

   - these have been identified and are being described in great depth. Recommendations on these issues will be made.

3. Develop recommendations, with appropriate alternatives, to be presented to the State Superintendent for his consideration in developing the DPI 1987-89 biennial budget proposal.

   - though the report is not yet completed, it is apparent that the numerous recommendations will be useful to the State Superintendent in developing his 1987-89 biennial budget proposal.

4. Develop recommendations that, if adopted, could stand the test of both time and change and resist ill-advised manipulation.

   - the recommendations being made are such that they form the basis for a strong school finance philosophy and system.

5. Develop recommendations for the short term and long term which could be easily adopted as state goals.

   - as stated above, the recommendations could form the basis for reachable state objectives in school finance.

Actual number of school districts involved.	432
Actual number of public school students involved.	All
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	All

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: School Improvement Program
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $6,500

Accomplishments

Administrative rules were written for the educational standards legislation during January-June of 1986. Rules should be finalized in August 1986. Advisory committees representative of LEAs and professional associations helped in writing rules. Twelve inservice presentations were held.

All high schools have mailed compliance forms to DPI on high school graduation standards. Follow-up has been made to those high schools where forms were incomplete/incorrect or indicated non-compliance.

CESAs and university personnel have been involved in regional and statewide meetings to plan school improvement and standards compliance. School improvement mini-grants from all CESAs have been received and are being processed and will be awarded. LEA school improvement mini-grants will be awarded in August. CESA and university follow-ups are being planned as part of the CESA and LEA mini-grant proposals.

Grants have been awarded to eligible schools for improving skill levels of low-income and low-achieving students in preschool through grade 5.

Three statewide meetings have been held involving gifted and talented students and their parents, teachers and administrators. Rules have been written for the identification of gifted and talented standard.

The rules for Education for Employment have been written. Regional awareness meetings have been held. Five demonstration grants have been awarded. All five grant sites have been visited and supervised.

Actual number of school districts involved.	432
Actual number of public school students involved.	All
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	All

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Science World
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $23,900

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The Science World program has a major focus on experiences provided to 8th grade students. The experiences include a variety of classroom and field activities, computer lab experiences and activities in an exploratorium. In all cases students are selected to have "hands on" encounters with science.

Applications are categorized by dividing the state into 6 regions with equal population. From each of these regions an equal number of boys and girls are selected as well as equitable participants from private and public schools. Additionally, minority representatives are sought.

Evaluations provided by students indicated it is the most stimulating, exciting and informative experience they have ever had in the area of science education.

The teacher component of Science World is a major objective of the program. One hundred twenty teachers were selected with 20 teachers attending each of 6 sessions. Teachers are provided the most up-to-date trends and concepts in science education by leading Wisconsin science educators. For the first time 2 sessions (40 teachers) participated in curriculum development as a focus on the new GUIDELINES TO CURRICULUM PLANNING IN SCIENCE.

Teacher participants were selected from both public and private schools.

Scientists from a wide variety of backgrounds serve as leaders in the Science World program. These scientists work with both teachers and students. It should be noted that the scientists include women as well as men.

Actual number of public school students involved.	307
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	69
Actual number of private school students involved.	77
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	32

Science World continues to be recognized as an outstanding program - perhaps one of the best in the entire country.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Teacher Incentives Pilot-Performance Assessment
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $1,400

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Four meetings of the Performance Assessment Committee (PAC) were held. Two teacher assessment instruments were developed.

The assessment instrument was field-tested in two school districts.

A 3-day training session for 35 staff from eight school districts was held.

Actual number of school districts involved.	8
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	35

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Teacher Incentive Pilot Testing
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $1,500

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

A recommendation regarding the test to be used in the first phase of the teacher testing program (basic skills) has been made to the State Superintendent and he has accepted that recommendation.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: UW-Platteville Middle School Project
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $25,600

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The clearinghouse for information about the young adolescent is now serving on a limited basis all school districts identified in the project proposal. The center staff reports that they are receiving many inquiries about materials and services.

The videotapes focusing on the educational needs of the young adolescent are in the planning stage. Cost proposals have been developed. Media people and consultants have been contacted. Choices will soon be made about scripts and tape preparation.

Some preliminary materials for parent education workshops have been gathered and further preparations will commence following the arrival of the associate director in August.

Preliminary planning has begun to establish a "model" induction design for inducting ten new teachers into the profession at the middle level.

The majority of the efforts to this point have been in the areas of selecting staff, collecting materials for the clearinghouse, preparing a brochure about the center and office and program planning. The present staff is now in the midst of trying to acquire computer access which they can use for the clearinghouse materials as well as for office operations, materials preparation and program planning.

Actual public school districts involved.	85
Actual number of public school students involved.	17,000
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	800
Actual number of private schools involved.	10
Actual number of private school students involved.	750
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	55

All schools, school personnel, and students in Wisconsin can profit from the resources developed in this program.

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Wisconsin Equal Opportunity Program
Early Identification Project
Division: School Financial Resources and Management Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $25,000

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The objective to increase the retention rates of minority and disadvantaged students enrolled in the Early Identification Program (EIP) has been met in that the EIP program has a 92% overall retention rate.

1. In 1982-83, 172 8th graders submitted signed parent agreements. Of those 172 8th graders, 145 are now high school seniors.

2. In 1983-84 200 students signed up for the EIP program. There are 166 of these students entering high school as juniors.

3. In 1984-85, 216 students submitted signed parent agreements. There are 218 of these students entering high school as sophmores.

4. In 1985-86, 238 students submitted signed parent agreements. Of the 238 students, 225 are entering high school as freshmen.

External resources have been identified to assist "at risk" senior and junior high school students who are enrolled in the EIP program.

Assistance has been provided in facilitating and promoting opportunities for part time employment and other out-of-school curriculum related experience for EIP students.

The EIP program worked with targeted schools, churches and community organizations to reduce high dropout rates among minority and disadvantaged students.

EIP provided academic counseling, advising, planning and other assistance in a coordinated manner with internal staff, secondary school personnel and appropriate college staff.

EIP students were introduced to various kinds of careers, professions and role models from education, business and industry.

EIP worked with parents of EIP students to identify support systems that will enable them to be more effective, resourceful and caring regarding the education of their children.

Actual number of public schools involved.	43
Actual number of school districts involved.	5
Actual number of public school students involved.	754
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	58
Actual number of private schools involved.	6
Actual number of private school students involved.	28
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	8

5% DISCRETIONARY BLOCK GRANT PROJECT

End-of-Year 1985-86
Program Evaluation

Title of Project: Wisconsin Improvement Program
Division: Instructional Services
Chapter 2 Funds: $14,594

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Contacts with institutions and schools have been increased. This communication makes program implementation more efficient and eliminates potential problems.

All funding proposals were reviewed and responded to in a thorough and efficient manner. Most letters of response were in the mail within 48 hours of receipt.

Collaborative work continues on several projects in the areas of teacher induction and mentoring. In addition to the support provided for these efforts, a number of contacts have been made in an effort to expand the internship program beyond the placement of classroom teachers only.

Increased communication has helped to strengthen the program and plans are presently underway to expand the concepts of recruitment, internship and induction.

Actual number of public schools involved.	105
Actual number of school districts involved.	72
Actual number of public school students involved.	5,000
Actual number of public school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	500
Actual number of private schools involved.	6
Actual number of private school students involved.	200
Actual number of private school teachers and/or other school personnel involved.	30

1985-86
STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

During the 1985-86 Chapter 2 program year, the State Advisory Committee for Chapter 2 met three times. The following includes the committee roster and a summary of the committee's accomplishments and minutes.

Leland Chenoweth
Route 2, Box 102
Blair, WI 54616

Joan Dykstra
4404 Fireside Circle
Racine, WI 53403

William A. Gollnick
P.O. Box 37
Oneida, WI 54155

The Reverend John P. Hanley
266 West Ottawa Avenue
Dousman, WI 53118

Ernest J. Korpela
P.O. Box 273
Cornucopia, WI 54826

Dennis Leaf
525 East Dover Street
Milwaukee, WI 53207

Senator Barbara Lorman
140A South, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702

Gloria Mason
7855 North Range Line Road
Milwaukee, WI 53209

Mildred Perry
7744 South North Cape Road
Franklin, WI 53132

Linda Stewart
3343 North 57 Street
Milwaukee, WI 53216

Representative Dwight York
308 West, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702

Senator Joseph Czarnezki
310 South, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702

Robert Ericson, Principal
North High School
1042 School Avenue
Sheboygan, WI 53081

Rafael Gomez
202 Valorie Lane, No. 6
Monona, WI 53716

Sandra Kinney
4471 East Balsam Lane
Rhinelander, WI 54501

John N. Kramer
1038 Lincoln Avenue
Fennimore, WI 53809

Wallace Lindholm, Supt.
Glenwood City School District
Highway 170
Glenwood City, WI 54013

Katharine Lyall
UW-Madison
1620 Van Hise Hall
Madison, WI 53706

Robert Osterhus
2612 Yorktown Court
Eau Claire, WI 54703

Martha Schmidt
3709 Zwerg Drive
Madison, WI 53705

Representative John Volk
112 North, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
125 South Webster Street • Box 7841 • Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7841
Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent / Tim Quinn, Deputy State Superintendent
(608) 266-1771

Date: December 8, 1986

To: Governor Anthony Earl
Governor-Elect Tommy Thompson

From: John Kramer, Chairperson
Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee

Subject: Final Committee Report, 1985-86

The Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee is appointed by the Governor to advise the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on the use of block grant funds in Wisconsin. As required by s. 14.019(5), the enclosed documents describe the committee's activities for 1985-86 as follows:

1) A letter from me to the State Superintendent transmitting committee recommendations for distribution of block grant funds in 1986-87.

2) A letter from the State Superintendent to me accepting the committee recommendations for distribution of block grant funds in 1986-87.

3) Minutes from the 1985-86 advisory committee meetings.

The first advisory committee meeting for 1986-87 has been scheduled for January 8, 1987, in Room 041 of General Executive Facility 3.

pc
enc

cc: Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent
Governor's Appointment Profile Coordinator
State Historical Society
Legislative Reference Bureau
DPI Reference and Loan Library

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
125 South Webster Street • Box 7841 • Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent / B. Dean Bowles, Deputy State Superintendent

April 10, 1986

The Honorable Herbert J. Grover
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Post Office Box 7841
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Dear Dr. Grover:

As chairperson of the Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee, I am formally transmitting the committee's recommendations for distribution of Wisconsin education block grant funds in 1986-87.

The committee recommends the allocation of block grant funds continue to provide 80 percent to local educational agencies and 20 percent to the state educational agency. The committee specified that 15 percent of the 20 percent should continue to be used for state administrative expenses and the remaining 5 percent continue to be used for discretionary projects (one-time educational improvement programs). In addition, the committee requested that the department prepare a report justifying the 15 percent budget figures and documenting how 15 percent-funded activities relate to the goals of Chapter 2.

The committee also recommended modifying the 1985-86 formula for distribution of LEA allocations. The revised formula will distribute LEA funds based 50 percent on school enrollment, 47 percent on the high-cost factor identified as AFDC, and 3 percent on the high-cost factor identified as sparsity. For future computations of the sparsity factor, the committee suggested the department obtain data on the number of square miles per school district to replace the county square mileage figures.

The committee wishes to thank you for your encouragement and for the staff support provided through Gary Johnson and others in the department. I enjoy working with the committee and look forward to returning as chairperson for a second year in 1986-87.

Sincerely,

John N. Kramer, Chairperson
Education Block Grant State
Advisory Committee

pc
cc: Gary K. Johnson, Assistant Superintendent
Division for Management and Budget
Members, Education Block Grant State
Advisory Committee

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
125 South Webster Street • Box 7841 • Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent / B. Dean Bowles, Deputy State Superintendent

May 12, 1986

Mr. John N. Kramer
1038 Lincoln Avenue
Fennimore, WI 53809

Dear Nick:

Thank you for your April 10 letter informing me of the State Advisory Committee recommendations for distribution of education block grant funds in 1986-87. I accept those recommendations and will submit them as part of our application to the Department of Education.

The work of the committee has proceeded quickly and thoroughly, and I am grateful for your leadership. Please express my appreciation to the members of the committee for their time and effort.

I look forward to your continued service as chairperson of the committee in 1986-87 as we work together on educational issues important to Wisconsin.

Sincerely,

Herbert J. Grover
State Superintendent

pc

MINUTES

Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee

Madison, Wisconsin

March 17, 1986

A meeting of the Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee was held March 17, 1986, at General Executive Facility 3, 125 South Webster Street, Madison.

Committee members in attendance were Mr. Chenoweth, Ms. Dykstra, Mr. Gollnick, Father Hanley, Mr. Korpela, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Leaf, Senator Lorman, Sister Olley, Mr. Osterhus, Ms. Schmidt, Dr. Stewart, and Representative Volk. Also present were Ms. Achtor, Ms. Bade, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Richgels, and Mr. Sunby of the Department of Public Instruction.

Chairman Kramer called the meeting to order at 10:20 a.m. and immediately convened the public hearing to receive testimony related to the block grant program in Wisconsin and the formula to be used for distribution of block grant funds in 1986-87. Testimony was presented by Robert Thompto, West Allis School District; Patricia Meloy, Wisconsin Association of Nonpublic Schools; and Rick Poulson, Milwaukee Public Schools. Following testimony from all parties present, Mr. Johnson cited written testimony received from seven school districts. Mr. Kramer requested that the department include with the public hearing testimony the March 7, 1986, letter to the committee from Mr. Johnson on behalf of the State Superintendent. Mr. Kramer then closed the public hearing and resumed the business portion of the meeting.

Mr. Johnson suggested changes to the January 27, 1986 minutes. A motion was made by Mr. Gollnick to adopt the changes and to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Representative Volk and unanimously adopted by the committee.

The following discussion and action by the committee occurred regarding recommendations to the State Superintendent on the use of block grant funds in 1986-87.

1. Motion

   Father Hanley made a motion that 80 percent of block grant funds in Wisconsin continue to be allocated to LEAs and 20 percent remain with the SEA. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dykstra. Without discussion, the committee unanimously adopted the motion.

2. Motion

Mr. Korpela made a motion to modify the 1985-86 formula for the distribution of LEA allocations by distributing LEA funds based 50 percent on school enrollment, 47 percent on the high-cost factor identified as AFDC, and 3 percent on the high-cost factor identified as sparsity. The motion was seconded by Mr. Leaf. Mr. Kramer suggested the department improve the method for determining the number of square miles per school district, since the county figures are not reliable. Without further discussion, the committee unanimously adopted the motion.

For future computations of the sparsity factor, the committee suggested the department obtain data on the number of square miles per district to replace the county square mileage figures.

3. Discussion

Chairman Kramer opened discussion on the split of the Chapter 2 20 percent state funds for 1986-87. Mr. Johnson referred the committee to the March 7, 1986 letter he sent on behalf of the State Superintendent regarding this issue. He explained that since he is new in the job he would like some time to address the concerns raised by SAC members and others, such as Ms. Meloy on behalf of WANS. He said he can't respond to what the department has done in the past but stated it is his intention to do everything he can to understand and respond to the concerns raised. Therefore, he requested that the committee approve the 15/5percent split for the state funds for another year. He then responded to questions from committee members regarding his statement and the March 7 letter.

Because Mr. Johnson is new and since the Gramm-Rudman legislation will have a significant impact on Chapter 2 funds, Father Hanley suggested the committee recommend the 15/5 percent split for one year with the intention that the 14/6 percent split be considered next year. Mr. Korpela supported the 15/5 percent split. It was requested by Ms. Stewart that in the fall the department provide the committee with a report on how the positions and projects charged to the 20 percent funds relate to the goals of Chapter 2.

Motion

Father Hanley made a motion that in 1986-87 15 percent of the 20 percent funds continue to be used for state administrative expenses and the remaining 5 percent continue to be used for discretionary projects. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chenoweth. Without further discussion, the committee unanimously adopted the motion.

Motion

Sister Olley made a motion to request the department to prepare a report which justifies the 15 percent budget figures and documents how the activities funded with the 15 percent funds relate to the goals of Chapter 2. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dykstra. The committee unanimously adopted the motion.

4. Discussion

Copies of the guidelines for the Chapter 2 mini grant projects were distributed. Mr. Johnson reviewed the guidelines with the committee and responded to questions and comments. Mr. Leaf commended the department for involving parents in the projects. Senator Lorman stated it is important that teachers receive information on the mini grants to ensure their involvement in the development and implementation of projects.

Motion

Father Hanley made a motion to adopt the mini grant guidelines. Mr. Leaf seconded the motion. The committee unanimously adopted the motion.

Ms. Achtor and Ms. Bade reported on the sessions they attended at the National Chapter 2 Conference in Washington, D.C., on February 24-26. An outline summarizing the sessions and copies of conference materials were distributed. Mr. Kramer and Mr. Chenoweth also discussed their experiences at the conference.

There being no further business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Bettejane Achtor
Secretary

MINUTES

Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee

Madison, Wisconsin

January 27, 1986

A meeting of the Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee was held January 27, 1986 at General Executive Facility 3, 125 South Webster Street, Madison.

Members in attendance were Mr. Chenoweth, Senator Czarnezki, Ms. Dykstra, Mr. Ericson, Mr. Gollnick, Mr. Gomez, Father Hanley, Mr. Korpela, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Leaf, Mr. Lindholm, Senator Lorman, Ms. Mason, Mr. Osterhus, Ms. Schmidt, and Representative York. Also present were Mr. Johnson, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Richgels, Mr. Sunby, and Ms. Achtor of the Department of Public Instruction.

Chairperson Kramer called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m., and roll call was taken. Since several members were unable to attend the first meeting, the committee unanimously approved the minutes of the December 6, 1985 meeting.

Mr. Kramer reported on the National Chapter 2 Conference which will be held in Washington D.C. on February 24-26. Mr. Kramer, Mr. Gollnick, and Father Hanley will represent the committee at the conference. Others who are interested were encouraged to contact Mr. Kramer after the meeting, since one other member could be selected to attend. Maryjean Bade and Bette Achtor will represent the DPI.

The election of a chairperson-elect was held. Mr. Lindholm nominated Senator Lorman, and Mr. Ericson nominated Mr. Korpela. Senator Lorman requested that her name be withdrawn from the nominations, because she felt it would be more beneficial to have a chairperson who understands the details of the program from having served as chairperson for one year. (The current chairperson-elect automatically succeeds as chairperson.) Mr. Korpela asked to have his name withdrawn for the same reason. The committee unanimously agreed to remove the names of Senator Lorman and Mr. Korpela from the nominations. Mr. Korpela made a motion for Mr. Kramer to succeed as chairperson-elect. The committee unanimously accepted the motion.

Mr. Korpela, chair of the formula subcommittee, reported the recommendations made by the subcommittee at the January 13 meeting. (Materials from that meeting were distributed to the other members.) The following discussion and action by the committee occurred:

1. Recommendation

   The formula for distributing funds to LEAs in 1986-87 should be 50 percent enrollment, 47 percent AFDC, and 3 percent sparsity.

   Discussion

   Representative York supported reducing the sparsity factor more than 3 percent but agreed the reduction should be done slowly.

The committee discussed reducing the sparsity factor from 5 percent to 3 percent. Representative York and Senator Czarnezki supported greatly reducing or eliminating the sparsity factor. In support of retaining the 5 percent sparsity factor were Senator Lorman, Ms. Mason, Father Hanley, and Ms. Schmidt. However, they will concur with 3 percent if that is the wish of the committee. (Information was distributed showing how much school districts would receive under the proposed formula using the current allocation.)

Senator Lorman indicated the sparsity factor was originally added because the formula didn't address the needs of rural areas. The AFDC factor sends most of the money to urban areas. Ms. Mason stated that both the sparsity and AFDC factors bring money to areas where it is most needed. It was noted by Ms. Schmidt that she voted against the proposed formula at the subcommittee meeting because she believes some of the sparsely populated farmland areas are depressed and can use the additional funds distributed through the sparsity factor.

The committee discussed using low income as a factor in the formula, but there wasn't a great deal of support for that suggestion.

Father Hanley made a motion that the committee adopt for 1986-87 the formula recommended by the subcommittee (50 percent enrollment, 47 percent AFDC, and 3 percent sparsity). The motion was adopted (15 ayes, 1 no).

2. Recommendation

The allocation of block grant funds should continue to provide 80 percent to LEAs and 20 percent to the SEA (DPI) in 1986-87.

Motion

Mr. Ericson moved that the committee adopt the subcommittee recommendation. Without discussion, the committee unanimously adopted the motion.

3. Recommendation

The subcommittee specified that, of the 20 percent funds reserved for state use in 1986-87, 14 percent should be used for state administrative expenses and 6 percent set aside for discretionary projects. In addition, the subcommittee suggested DPI eventually reduce to 10 percent the funds used for state administration.

Discussion

Mr. Johnson informed the committee that a 1 percent reduction in state administration would be approximately $97,500, or 3 to 7 positions. A 5 percent reduction would be approximately $500,000, or 15 to 35 positions. The DPI currently holds positions vacant on the block grant, because salary and fringe increases have caused a shortage of funds, and the annual federal grant doesn't increase. The 1 percent loss for administration would require layoffs in DPI. The affect of Gramm-Rudman also must be considered. Mr. Johnson asked the committee to support retaining the 20 percent split at 15 percent for administration and 5 percent for special projects.

Mr. Lindholm reminded the committee that their responsibility is to advise the State Superintendent on the use of block grant funds, and that Dr. Grover does not have to accept the advice of the committee.

Ms. Mason asked if it is necessary to fill the vacant positions on the block grant. If someone currently is performing that work, it would seem the department can get along without those positions.

Senator Lorman raised the question of whether more appropriate staff could be charged to the block grant. Some of the staff charged have nothing to do with Chapter 2.

It was Representative York's contention that not every person charged to the block grant directly provides block grant services. It is the committee's job to recommend that the money be used for children, and he asked the committee to support the 14 percent /6 percent split for the 20 percent funds. If Dr. Grover agrees to support a 14.5 percent/5.5 percent split, DPI is making an effort. If Dr. Grover says he can't support a change, then Representative York will accept his decision.

Representative York make a motion that the committee adopt the subcommittee recommendation to change the split of the 20 percent funds for 1986-87 to 14 percent for state administrative expenses and 6 percent for discretionary projects with an eventual reduction to 10 percent for state administrative expenses.

The motion passed unanimously.

Father Hanley, program subcommittee chair, reported the recommendation made at the January 13 meeting. (Materials used by the subcommittee were distributed to the other members.) The following discussion and action by the committee occurred:

Recommendation

The 5 percent discretionary funds should be used for programs that directly impact students in LEAs rather than indirectly through teacher, administrator, or facility improvement.

Discussion

Senator Lorman wanted to reinforce the earlier recommendation providing 6 percent of the 20 percent funds for special projects by recommending that the 6 percent funds be used to directly impact students.

Mr. Korpela stated the 80 percent funds are for school districts to provide direct services to students. The 20 percent funds are available for the SEA to use in the most beneficial way to support the goals of Chapter 2. Elementary and secondary education is at a point where it must improve the basic skills of students, but it is just as important to improve the skills of administrators and teachers.

Mr. Ericson supported Mr. Korpela and added that each of the 5 percent projects benefits students in some manner.

The question was raised as to how the 5 percent projects would be funded if block grant funds weren't available. Mr. Johnson explained that the 1985-87 budget request asked for support for some of the 5 percent projects, but most of them were rejected. The department gave up some curriculum development money in budget reductions this year.

Mr. Korpela stated it is admirable to want to deal directly with students, but money for research and demonstration also is needed.

Father Hanley stated that the subcommittee didn't mean to eliminate programs. The subcommittee's intent was to provide direction for the programs funded with discretionary money. Currently, the project descriptions don't indicate how students will benefit. The subcommittee would like to see how students benefit from the projects.

Senator Lorman stated the subcommittee's intent is not to restrict programs but to provide direction.

Father Hanley made a motion that the committee adopt the subcommittee's recommendation that the 5 percent discretionary funds for special projects be used for programs that directly impact students in LEAs rather than indirectly through teacher, administrator, or facility improvement.

The committee adopted the motion (11 ayes, 2 noes).

The committee agreed to hold a public hearing on March 17, 1986 in Madison to receive comments regarding the committee's recommendations and other matters pertaining to the block grant. The hearing will begin at 10:00 a.m., and the committee will meet immediately following the hearing to finalize the recommendations to the State Superintendent.

Bettejane Achtor
Secretary

MK6

MINUTES

Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee

Madison, Wisconsin

December 6, 1985

The meeting of the Education Block Grant State Advisory Committee was held December 6, 1985 at General Executive Facility 3, 125 South Webster Street, Madison.

Committee members in attendance were Ms. Dykstra, Mr. Ericson, Mr. Gollnick, Mr. Gomez, Father Hanley, Mr. Kramer, Senator Lorman, Ms. Mason, Mr. Osterhus, Dr. Stewart, Representative Volk, and Representative York. Also present were Ms. Byars, Mr. Sunby, Ms. Achtor, and Ms. Bade for the Department of Public Instruction and Ms. Williams for Dr. Lyall.

Chairperson Kramer called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m. Roll call was taken, and introductions were made.

Ms. Byars gave a background report on Chapter 2 and provided materials. The committee was informed that President Reagan signed into law in 1981 the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA). Chapter 2 of the act consolidated 30 categorical programs into one block grant. Wisconsin received approximately $9 million annually for the first three years of the program, and in 1985-86 the grant was almost $10 million. The intent of the block grant is to provide less federal regulation and more local discretion in use of funds. The block grant has a threefold purpose: (1) basic skills development, (2) educational improvement and support services, and (3) special projects. The state educational agency (SEA) is responsible for administering and supervising programs assisted under Chapter 2. These programs must meet objectives listed under Subchapters A, B, and C of the law. Each year, the Department of Public Instruction submits a three-year plan or amendment to the plan to the United States Department of Education (USDE) for approval.

Chapter 2 law requires the Governor to appoint a state advisory committee. The initial appointments were made in January 1982 and the first committee meeting held in February 1982. Approximately one-third of the appointments expire each year. The committee advises the State Superintendent on the use of block grant funds. The basic question each year is how much advice and direction should be provided to the State Superintendent in this regard. Primary debate has revolved around the distribution formula. However, last year more attention was given to state programs funded with Chapter 2. Ideally, the committee should try to conclude its work by the end of February, since the school districts are in the process of developing the next year's budget at that time.

Of the block grant money received in Wisconsin, 80 percent is required by law to flow through to LEAs. The remaining 20 percent can flow through or be retained at the state level for statewide purposes. In the past, the advisory committee has voted to retain 20 percent at the state level. Of the 20 percent, 5 percent has been used for discretionary projects determined by the State Superintendent. The remaining 15 percent has been used for agency staffing. Many positions formerly funded by ESEA V were transferred to block grant funding. At that time, the DPI reduced personnel expenditures from approximately $1.7 million to approximately $1.3 million. The 15 percent currently is at $1.4 million. Salary and fringe increases have caused a shortage of funds, and DPI has frozen some of the positions to save money. The department will need to decide if they should go into the 5 percent or lay off staff. This issue will have to be addressed at a future advisory committee meeting. Positions funded by the 15 percent represent most of the support services of the agency.

Ms. Byars discussed some of the special projects funded statewide by the discretionary funds and responded to questions. The program subcommittee will go further indepth on these programs so the committee will have an opportunity to review and understand them.

The committee was informed that the revised regulations of December 1983 were technical amendments. The Conference Report that accompanied the regulations was not included in the final regulations. The USDE decided the report language would undermine Congress' central purpose in enacting Chapter 2, which was to make it a state-administered program with a minimal federal role. The final regulations allow each SEA to decide whether they want to implement the Conference Report language.

Ms. Byars discussed the reimbursement guidelines for the committee and reviewed committee bylaws.

Ms. Byars provided a brief overview on issues concerning Chapter 2 in the DPI's 1985-87 budget. Some Chapter 2-funded projects, such as Science World and Arts World, received state funding, and others, such as the Regional Service Units, Administrative Assessment Centers, and Academic Decathlon, did not. The department must decide if the projects that didn't receive state funding should continue to be supported with Chapter 2 funds or be discontinued.

Ms. Bade and Ms. Achtor summarized the USDE review of Wisconsin's Chapter 2 program last summer. Information was provided on what the department is doing to respond to the concerns raised by USDE.

Mr. Sunby provided an update on the Milwaukee private schools bypass issue. Father Hanley gave the history on the inequitable distribution between the public and private schools in Milwaukee and explained his role in the situation. The Catholic and Lutheran churches agreed to the inequitable distribution for 1982-83 and 1983-84, because they felt it was needed for Milwaukee's desegregation efforts. (Milwaukee was under court order to desegregate its schools.)

The election of the Chairperson-Elect was postponed until the next meeting, since only 12 members were present. (Senator Lorman made a motion for postponement, and the committee unanimously agreed.)

Chairperson Kramer suggested that the following members serve on the Formula Subcommittee: Senator Joseph Czarnezki, Robert Ericson, Sandra Kinney, Gloria Mason, Martha Schmidt, Linda Stewart, and Representative Dwight York with Ernest Korpela as chair. Mr. Kramer recommended the following members serve on the Program Subcommittee: Leland Chenoweth, Joan Dykstra, William Gollnick, Rafael Gomez, Senator Barbara Lorman, Katharine Lyall, and Representative John Volk with Father John Hanley as chair. It was moved by Representative York that a unanimous ballot be cast for the subcommittee appointments. The motion carried.

The next meeting of the full committee was scheduled for January 27 at 1:00 p.m. in Madison. The committee agreed to set a public hearing date at that meeting. The hearing will allow the committee to receive input from the public on formula recommendations and other issues. The Formula Subcommittee meeting was scheduled for January 13 at 9:30 a.m. and the Program Subcommittee meeting for January 13 at 1:00 p.m. If necessary, the subcommittees will meet again the morning of January 27.

Ms. Bade informed the committee about the national Chapter 2 conference in Washington, D.C. on February 25-26. The USDE has suggested that three to four representatives be sent. Suggested representatives are the SAC chairperson and state, private school, and LEA representatives. Representative York motioned that the chairperson make the appointments for attendance at the conference. The committee unanimously adopted the motion.

There being no further business before the committee, Father Hanley motioned adjournment. The committee unanimously adopted the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Bettejane Achtor
Secretary

1985-86
Chapter 2 LEA Evaluation Survey Results

How well did you accomplish the education improvements planned with your 1985-86 funds.

	Number	Percent
Very Well	209	56
To Our Satisfaction	156	42
To Our Partial Satisfaction	9	2
Not Satisfactory	0	0
Total Reporting	374	100

1985-86
CHAPTER 2 USES OF FUNDS BY LEAS

	Number	Percent
Improvement of Administrative Practices	36	10
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse	27	7
Art	34	9
Community Education	7	2
Curriculum Planning	53	14
Driver Education	6	2
EEN - Exceptional Education	25	7
English/Language Arts	92	25
Reading	87	23
Composition	58	16
Speech	20	5
Dramatic Arts	14	4
Environmental Education	17	5
Family Education/Parent Partnership	8	2
Foreign Languages	23	6
Gifted and Talented Program	88	24
Guidance/Counseling	57	15
Health	30	8
Learning Disadvantaged Programs	22	6
Library/IMC Program	195	52
Mathematics	106	28
Music	36	10
Physical Education	13	4
Preschool	8	2
Program for Students "At Risk"	28	8
Limited English Proficiency Programs	4	1
School Improvement	69	19
Science	107	29
Social Studies	76	20
Staff Development	80	21
Vocational Curriculum	25	7
Agriculture	15	4
Business/Distributive Education	56	15
Home Economics/Consumer Education	23	6
Industrial Education	47	13

1985-86
USES OF FUNDS FOR COMPUTERS IN EDUCATION

	Number	Percent
Planning For Use of Computers	29	8
Curriculum Development For Computer Development	40	11
Inservice/Training For Use of Computers	43	12
Computer Education	68	18
Computer Aided Learning	163	44
Computer Managed Education	34	9
Computer Personnel	9	2
Computer Hardware Acquisition	178	48
Computer Software Acquisition	112	30
Office Automation	26	7
Management Information Systems	11	3

1985-86
METHODS OF PARENT AND TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN CHAPTER 2

	Parents	Percent	Teachers	Percent
Chapter 2 Advisory Committee	164	44	210	56
Chapter 2 Meetings/Hearings	132	35	160	43
Newsletters/Newspaper Articles	201	54	141	38
Open Houses/PTO	152	41	103	28
Other Advisory Committees	84	22	98	26
Other Meetings	68	18	115	31
Proposal Review Groups	60	16	100	27
School Board Meetings	300	80	201	54
Telephone/Letters	70	19	72	19

TABLE 13

ECIA CHAPTER 2 STUDENT PARTICIPANTS AND EXPENDITURES
FOR 1985-86 AS REPORTED ON LEA APPLICATIONS

Subchapter A - Basic Skills Development

Category	Public School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Reading	$60,723	0.80	22
Mathematics	56,693	0.75	15
Written and Oral Communication	31,110	0.41	12
Comprehensive Program	61,214	0.81	19
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER A	$209,740	2.77	

Category	Public School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Reading	$7,866	0.10	12
Mathematics	2,014	0.03	4
Written and Oral Communication	3,358	0.04	2
Comprehensive Program	10,035	0.13	4
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER A	$23,273	0.31	

Subchapter B - Education Improvement and Support Services

Category	Private School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Library/Media Materials	$626,643	8.29	165
Textbooks	112,157	1.48	39
Instructional Equipment	2,862,822	37.86	297
Local Improvement Program	767,980	10.16	91
Program for Minority Children	22,350	0.30	3
Guidance/Counseling/Testing	140,767	1.86	29
Improvement of Educational Planning	101,667	1.34	29
Teacher/Training/In-Service Staff Development	403,275	5.33	82
Desegregation Programs	1,136,385	15.03	1
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER B	$6,174,046	81.66	

Category	Private School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Library/Media Materials	$108,497	1.44	79
Textbooks	754,032	9.97	163
Instructional Equipment	5,276	0.07	4
Local Improvement Program	9,575	0.13	6
Program for Minority Children	0	0.00	0
Guidance/Counseling/Testing	1,200	0.02	2
Improvement of Educational Planning	300	0.00	1
Teacher Training/In-Service Staff Development	3,156	0.04	6
Desegregation Programs	0	0.00	0
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER B	$882,035	11.67	

Subchapter C - Special Projects

Category	Public School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Metric Education	0	0.00	0
Arts in the Curriculum	$27,087	0.36	17
In-school and Pre-school Parent partnership	4,200	0.06	2
Consumer Education	690	0.01	1
Preparation for Employment	16,789	0.22	5
Career Education	4,641	0.06	6
Environmental/Health/Law-related/Population/ International Understanding	45,853	0.61	9
Academic and Vocational Education for Offenders	0	0.00	0
Biomedical/Medical Science Career Education for Disadvantaged	0	0.00	0
Gifted and Talented Education	112,793	1.49	31
Competency Standards Program	12,684	0.17	7
Safe Schools Program	0	0.00	0
Ethnic Heritage Studies	1,105	0.01	1
Civil Rights Training	0	0.00	0
Community Education	11,451	0.15	4
Other	30,037	0.40	11
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER C	$6,651,116	87.97	

Category	Private School Allotments	% of Total	# Districts Participating
Metric Education	$324	0.00	1
Arts in the Curriculum	0	0.00	0
In-school and Pre-school Parent partnership	0	0.00	0
Consumer Education	566	0.01	1
Preparation for Employment	0	0.00	0
Career Education	0	0.00	0
Environmental/Health/Law-related/Population/ International Understanding	0	0.00	0
Academic and Vocational Education for Offenders	0	0.00	0
Biomedical/Medical Science Career Education for Disadvantaged	0	0.00	0
Gifted and Talented Education	1,355	0.02	2
Competency Standards Program	0	0.00	0
Safe School Program	0	0.00	0
Ethnic Heritage Studies	0	0.00	0
Civil Rights Training	0	0.00	0
Community Education	0	0.00	0
Other	2,000	0.03	1
TOTAL FOR SUBCHAPTER C	$4,245	0.06	